

Copyright

by

Matthew Bran Davies

The Dissertation Committee for Matthew Bran Davies certifies that this is the approved
version of the following dissertation:

The 2nd Earl of Essex and the History Players: the Factional Writing of John Hayward,
William Shakespeare, Samuel Daniel, and George Chapman.

Committee:

Frank Whigham, Supervisor

James Loehlin

J.K. Barret

Alan Friedman

Brian Levack

**The 2nd Earl of Essex and the History Players: the Factional Writing of John
Hayward, William Shakespeare, Samuel Daniel, and George Chapman**

By

Matthew Bran Davies, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

December 2012

To my mother,
For her impeccable timing

**The 2nd Earl of Essex and the History Players: the Factional Writing of John
Hayward, William Shakespeare, Samuel Daniel, and George Chapman**

Matthew Bran Davies, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2012

Supervisor: Frank Whigham

Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, Queen Elizabeth's last favorite and the last man she executed for treason, has been harshly treated by posterity. Given his leading role at court in what Patrick Collinson calls the "nasty nineties," Essex has taken much of the blame for the divisive factional politics of Elizabeth's final decade. However, leading recent efforts to salvage Essex's reputation, historian Paul Hammer has uncovered a sophisticated bureaucracy operated by highly educated scholars and led by an intelligent, cultivated statesman. A considerable number of high-profile literary figures, moreover, willingly engaged with this ambitiously expanding Essex faction. This thesis proposes that evidence of interference by the censor and the Privy Council, sensitive to a politicized historiography promoting the Earl's interests chiefly on London's stages, discloses the presence of a loose, autonomous federation of authors associated with the Essex and post-Essex factions between 1590 and 1610.

This thesis considers the suspected works of an eclectic group of writers bonded by their ideological affiliations with Essex's "radical moderatism": civil lawyer John Hayward's prose history of *The Life and Raigne of Henrie IIII* (1599); William Shakespeare's second "tetralogy" (1595-99) dealing with the same historical period; Samuel Daniel's closet drama of the downfall of the Greek general *Philotas* (1605); and innovative playwright George Chapman's double tragedy set in France, *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron* (1608). I situate these authors within the intellectual and public relations wing of the Essex circle in order to consider how they made contact with the center and with each other, and where they resided within the broader operation of the faction; what they offered and what they expected in return; how they shaped political thinking and how their dramaturgy developed as a consequence; whether they were attracted by the purse or the person; and to what extent they were artistically or ideologically motivated. In considering, finally, whether these writers worked in collaboration or alone, on message or off-the-cuff, as propagandists or political commentators, I illuminate the critically neglected role of the factional writer in early modern England.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter 1 “A Lively Patterne of Things to Come”: John Hayward’s Dramatic Historiography	40
Chapter 2 “This is miching malicho; it means mischief”: Shakespeare and the Politics of Oblique Allusion	100
Chapter 3 Samuel Daniel and the Eloquence of Silence	169
Chapter 4 “Brave relics of a complete man”: George Chapman and the post-Essex Faction	230
Conclusion	305
Bibliography	318
Vita	361

Introduction

In the popular imagination, Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex (1566-1601), resembles Errol Flynn, the dashing, headstrong, high-spirited, and reckless young aristocrat who, in the Michael Curtiz film, *The Private Lives of Elizabeth and Essex* (Warner Brothers, 1939), loses his head for exploiting the romantic delusions of a grotesquely aging Bette Davis as Queen Elizabeth. Until surprisingly recently, historians tended to endorse this Technicolor caricature, labeling Essex a schoolboy, a butterfly, a rotten apple,¹ above all, a “favorite,” with all the unmerited and temporary preferment that loaded term implies. Given his lead role in what Patrick Collinson calls the “nasty nineties,”² Essex, playing the debonair yet somewhat hysterical juvenile to Walter Raleigh’s sturdy leading man and Secretary Robert Cecil’s brilliantly scheming character actor, takes much of the blame for the divisive factional politics of Elizabeth’s final decade. A close intimate of Shakespeare’s patron the Earl of Southampton, and known for his fondness for the playhouses and the tiltyard, Essex has been tarred with the theatrical brush: a “playboy of the western world.”³

¹ DNB V, p.89, cited in Hammer, *Polarization of Elizabethan Politics* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 4; M.M. Reese, *The Royal Office of Master of the Horse* (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 1976), 164; L.B. Smith, *Treason in Tudor England: Politics and Paranoia* (London: Random House, 2006), 191.

² Patrick Collinson, "Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism" in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John Guy (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 150.

³ J.B. Black, *The Reign of Elizabeth: 1558-1603* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1949), iii. A Victorian historian, Black was one of the first to reconsider Essex’s poor reputation.

Although historian Paul E.J. Hammer credits various crusaders with beginning the process of salvaging Essex's reputation, he concedes that such efforts have been "piecemeal"⁴ and, building upon a considerable body of research and writing since the early 1990s, Hammer himself must take credit for shaping our evolving conception of Essex as a major late Elizabethan statesman, whose ideas and ideologies helped frame the early modern political landscape, and whose strikingly sophisticated bureaucracy is prototypical of the media-savvy, information-gathering party machines of modern politics. In his magisterial, if partial, *The Polarization of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-97* (1999), Hammer complains that "modern historiography has largely squeezed ideas and ideology out of the grand narrative of Elizabethan politics, boiling conflict down to matters of personality and rivalry over patronage." Moreover, in spite of the "creative outpourings of politically aware writers such as Shakespeare, Marlowe, Spenser, and Sidney," he notes, "literary works have long been consigned to the margins of 'history' as ornaments, rather than serious expressions of political ideas."⁵

Judging by the censorious attentions visited upon a number of authors suspected of promoting Essex's ambitions and dissonant energies, both during the tempestuous last years of his career and in the decade following his execution in 1601, Hammer has a point. The four most prominent instances of government intrusion form the basis of this thesis. Three of these cases resulted in trials or interrogation. For writing *The Life and Raigne of Henrie IIII* (1599), a short, politic prose history with an offending dedication to

⁴ Hammer, *Polarization of Elizabethan Politics* 7.

⁵ Hammer, *Polarization of Elizabethan Politics* xi-xii.

Essex, civil lawyer John Hayward endured two interrogations and three years imprisonment in the Tower of London. The remounting of Shakespeare's *Richard II* at the Globe the afternoon before Essex's failed uprising of February 8 1601 -- which might or might not have staged the textually censored deposition of the King by Essex forebear, Henry Bolingbroke -- caused an actor from the Chamberlain's Men to be brought before the Star Chamber to defend his company against treason charges. In 1605, four years after Essex's death, Samuel Daniel, coterie poet and occasional closet dramatist, was hauled before the Privy Council for allegedly fashioning parallels between the political show trials of Philotas, Greek general to Alexander the Great, and Essex, Elizabeth's former Knight Marshall. Three years later, George Chapman, innovative dramatist and Homeric translator, escaped interrogation and imprisonment only because he fled to Scotland, leaving three of his boy actors to carry the can: his double tragedy, *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron* (1608), which seemingly fused Essex, his French counterpart, Byron, and the furious Achilles into an amalgam of rebellious energies, got the Children of the Chapel evicted from their Blackfriars Playhouse and all playing in London suspended for three months. Although these authors avoided physical punishment, all of their offending texts, and/or those closely associated with them, suffered material expurgation, leaving their "poore dismembered poems" in various states of deformity.

Other associates of Essex, who are only tangentially considered in this study, took evasive action in order to prevent arrest. Edmund Spenser's *A Vewe of the Present State of Ireland*, which championed Essex as Lord Deputy of Ireland, was written in 1598 but

went unpublished until 1633, three decades after the author's death.⁶ In the immediate aftermath of his cousin's execution, Fulke Greville sacrificed to the fire his unpublished play *Antony and Cleopatra* "lest, while he seemed to look over-much upward, he might stumble into the astronomer's pit: many members [...] seeing the like instance not poetically, but really, fashioned in the Earl of Essex then falling."⁷ Yet a surprisingly large number of literary figures during this period risked exposure to the poisonous atmosphere venting from the fissures of a succession crisis and the collateral damage from the bruising clashes between factions jockeying for position; they more or less willingly engaged with the ambitiously expanding Essex faction. Perhaps for the first time, professional, independent authors were called upon to record, interrogate, even to shape political events on the national stage. It seems only appropriate therefore that Hammer acknowledges the contribution of literary scholars in helping fashion "a strikingly different image of Essex -- that of an intelligent and highly cultivated aristocrat [and] a truly substantial political figure."⁸

Yet the dramatists who excited so much interest from the authorities in reality play a minor role in Hammer's historiography. Although the span of his book extends only to 1597, the year censorious intrusions into Essexian literature began in earnest, all the authors in this study enjoyed associations with (or sometimes against) the faction reaching back into the early 1590s. It is striking, then, that in more than four hundred

⁶ Edmund Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, ed. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley (London: Wiley-Blackwell, 1997), 228.

⁷ *The Prose Works of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke*, ed. John Gouws (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 93. In his "Dedication to Sir Philip Sidney," Greville here writes of himself in the third person.

⁸ Hammer, *Polarization of Politics*, 7.

pages of Hammer's dense historical analysis, Shakespeare, Hayward, and Daniel receives only one mention each, and these in footnotes, while Chapman is overlooked entirely. In Hammer's numerous journal and book articles, mostly written post-*Polarization*, the playwrights become somewhat more visible, yet only Shakespeare is brought center stage, and that in a discussion of the *Richard II* commission that cautiously skirts around the issue of authorial intention and which concludes that the play's topicality was retroactive and imposed by external events:⁹ lacking demonstrable political agency, the playwright is sent back to the margins.

The absence of these history players -- a term I use to encompass dramatic historiographers like Hayward and historiographic dramatists like Shakespeare -- is surprising because of Hammer's critical revelations concerning Essex's bureaucracy. Staffed by highly educated and politically motivated secretaries whose primary function was to gather, analyze, and communicate complex information from across Europe,¹⁰ Essex's bureaucrats differed from Robert Cecil's "base penn clerks"¹¹ in their semi-autonomous capacity to launch multi-media public relations campaigns, sometimes at lightning speed and employing guerilla tactics. A glamorous aristocrat with an extraordinary popular touch, Essex, by the mid-1590s, realized that he could maximize his exposure and spread his aggressive foreign policy message through direct intercession with the people, a populist "courtship" that brought him into increasing conflict with his

⁹ Hammer, "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 60.2 (2009), 27-28.

¹⁰ Hammer, "The Uses of Scholarship: The Secretariat of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex, c. 1585-1601," *The English Historical Review* 109.430 (1994), 26.

¹¹ Hammer, "The Uses of Scholarship," 30.

monarch and her ministers.¹² Paintings, sculptures, ballads, pamphlets, and prose histories were all deployed in service to the cause in return for Essex's extensive and often generous patronage.¹³ Yet in the metro-centric political reality of late-Elizabethan England, the most immediate way to communicate to a broad public gathering -- be it a coterie crowd at the private halls or to the citizenry at the public playhouses -- was from the stages of London's theaters. A theatrical aficionado, Essex strove to exploit the stage as much as its dramatists sought to invest in what Hayward termed "his expectation of future time."¹⁴

Building on Hammer's exploration of Essex's employment of scholars, this thesis proposes to situate the authors and their dramatized historiographies within the intellectual and public relations wing of the Essex circle in order to consider how they made contact with the center and with each other, and where they resided within the broader operation of the faction; what they offered and what they expected in return; how they shaped political thinking and how their dramaturgy and politic rhetoric developed as a consequence; whether they were attracted by the purse or the person; and to what extent they were artistically or ideologically motivated. In considering, finally, whether these writers worked in collaboration or alone, on message or off-the-cuff, as propagandists or

¹² Hammer, "'The Smiling Crocodile': The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan 'Popularity'," in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007), 105.

¹³ See especially Hammer, "Myth-Making: Politics, Propaganda and the Capture of Cadiz in 1596," *The Historical Journal* 40.3 (1997): 621-42.

¹⁴ For Hayward's dedication to Essex, see *The First and Second Parts of John Hayward's 'the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII'*, ed. John J. Manning (London: Royal Historical Society, 1991), 61.

political commentators, I hope to illuminate the critically neglected role and function of the factional writer in early modern England.

No evidence exists that the writers in this study were political cohorts, literary collaborators, or personal companions; such claims are largely hearsay collected by writers of later generations.¹⁵ Nor did they enjoy especially close relations with Essex, who, although an active patron,¹⁶ in all likelihood offered direct financial support to Daniel only, and that in a period much earlier than his contentious play.¹⁷ As a product of factional affiliation rather than cultural patronage, the literary formulation I propose depends less on kinship, friendship, or even financial remuneration than on ideological empathy with the glamorous young star in the political firmament. Essex's "radical moderatism," which, according to J.H.M. Salmon, sought to counter the "religious and monarchical extremism intruding from the continent in the last decades of the sixteenth century,"¹⁸ offered these writers a broad church and a lofty pulpit from which to communicate. In the absence of the material evidence of ideological commitment that we might expect to find -- manifestos, letters of intent, authorial receipts, roll calls, and the

¹⁵ The Caroline antiquarian Anthony à Wood, for example, asserts without basis that Chapman "settled in the metropolis and became much admired by Edmund Spenser, Samuel Daniel, Wm. Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe, etc."

¹⁶ During the 1590s Essex received more literary dedications and patronized more works than the Queen and, according to Leonard Bird, Essex gave financial remuneration to twenty-two of the sixty-six known requests he received; see, "the Earl of Essex, Patron of Letters," Ph.D. diss., unpublished, University of Utah, 1969.

¹⁷ In an Apology appended to *Philotas* (1605), Daniel writes of "having beene particularly beholding to [Essex's] bounty"; see *The Tragedy of Philotas by Samuel Daniel*, ed. Laurence Michel (New Haven: Yale UP, 1949), 157. Whatever financial support Daniel received from Essex must have ended at least six years earlier, with Essex's expedition to Ireland in 1599.

¹⁸ J.H.M. Salmon, "Stoicism and Roman Example: Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50 (1989), 202-4.

like -- I turn instead to the suspected texts themselves to consider how they relate to one another, and how their intertextuality might have contributed to their sequestration or suppression by the government's various censorious bodies.

As a result of my research, this thesis proposes that evidence of interference by the censor, acutely sensitive to a politicized historiography promoted by the Essex faction emerging on London's stages, disclosed the presence of a loose, autonomous federation of authors associated with the Essex and post-Essex factions. In the following sections of this Introduction, I first consider the shape and structural integrity of the Essex "church," a critical issue whose resolution should liberate this argument from the formalist strictures of earlier studies into factional literature of the time. After discussing the neglect of factional writers in the critical conversation on political authorship in the period, I then introduce the twin indicators that locate and define a literary circle within the Essex faction: the operation of censorship and the politic historiography that provoked it. I conclude this Introduction with a brief synopsis of the evolution of the politicized form of dramatic historiography associated with the Essex faction.

1. Schools of thought

This thesis is not the first written study to attempt a literary codification of writers seemingly promoting a "great patronus," or political patron.¹⁹ Of the two factions that

¹⁹ M.D. Jardine, in "New Historicism for Old: New Conservatism for Old?: The Politics of Patronage in the Renaissance." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991), discusses the factional politics of the 1590s centered around "the personality cult of the great patronus," 287.

“helped to poison the political atmosphere of London in the 1590s,”²⁰ Sir Walter Raleigh’s “School of Night” is the one that has previously been invested with an intelligence wing, a subset of intellectuals and writers that allegedly promulgated a group manifesto and personality. The phrase “School of Night,” which was coined by the Jesuit provocateur Robert Parsons in 1592, was later taken up by Shakespeare (in a gesture sometimes characterized as confrontational and schismatic) in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (1594-95) to satirize the esoteric activities of a group of scholars under Ferdinand, King of Navarre. In her 1937 study of the same name, Muriel Bradbrook makes a persuasive case for the outbreak of a literary war in the mid-1590s waged mainly between Chapman and Shakespeare as literary spokesmen for the Raleigh and Essex factions, respectively.²¹ Deploying her brilliant erudition, Bradbrook ravel[s] up the complex literary strands of a notoriously secretive and skeptical group of writers, headed by the navigator and mathematician Thomas Harriot, which, she openly concedes, shared no ideological or political purpose beyond a kind of Keatsian “negative capability” and an inclination toward the heterodox.²²

²⁰ Robert Shephard, “Court Factions in Early Modern England,” *Journal of Modern History* 64.4 (1992), 735.

²¹ Chapman’s arcane transcendental poem *The Shadow of Night* (1593), so Bradbrook argues, provoked Shakespeare’s ridicule of the Chapmanesque pedant Holofernes in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (1594). Chapman rebuffed this attack in the epistle to freethinking playwright Matthew Roydon that accompanied his revision of *The Shadow of Night* the same year. Chapman then likely contributed (possibly with Roydon) to the collaboratively anonymous parable *Willobie his Avis* in the fall of 1594, which arguably mocks Shakespeare (“W.S.”) as an actor involved in an illicit passion. A year later, Chapman’s poem *Ovid’s Banquet of Senses*, so Bradbrook claims, attempted to rival *Venus and Adonis*, the erotic poem Shakespeare dedicated to the young Earl of Southampton; Bradbrook 23-25.

²² See Muriel Bradbrook, *The School of Night: A Study in the Literary Relationships of Sir Walter Raleigh*, (Cambridge: CUP, 1936), 64.

Bradbrook's masterwork of intertextual analysis soon fell out of favor, however; the apogee of a discredited branch of historicist criticism led by William Minto, J.M. Robertson, and Arthur Acheson that, intent on elevating Shakespeare's status as a political player at court, implicated him in elaborate factional conspiracies and professional rivalries.²³ "The effect of all this," writes *Love's Labour's Lost* editor H.R. Woudhuysen, was to turn Shakespeare's works into "enigmas [and] riddles, which only those in the know could solve."²⁴ While Bradbrook largely avoided her predecessors' overheated theories, she perpetuated their notions of a secret society by imagining the presence of an actual school, to which she gave a headmaster (Raleigh), a head teacher (Harriot), a head boy (the "wizard" Earl of Northumberland), a syllabus (applied science and occultism), and scholars (Marlowe, Chapman [before he turned colors], and Jonson, among others). Yet, as A.E. Strathmann notes in his swift riposte to Bradbrook's hypothesis, while Raleigh's associates were often referred to as a "coterie," there is not a "single unmistakable instance in which the group was called 'The School of Night'."²⁵ By concretizing the metaphor, Bradbrook traps herself in an extended analogy that had no literal foundation.

More than a matter of semantics, Strathmann's concerns interrogate our conceptions of political formations during the period. Schools of political and religious

²³ William Minto, *Characteristics of English Poets from Chaucer to Shirley* (Boston: Ginn & Co, 1889; J.M. Robertson *Shakespeare and Chapman: a thesis of Chapman's authorship of 'A Lover's Complaint', and his originat* (London: T.F. Unwin, 1917). Arthur Acheson, *Shakespeare, Chapman, and 'Sir Thomas More'* (New York: Edmund Byrne Hackett, 1931).

²⁴ *Love's Labour's Lost*, ed. H.R. Woudhuysen, Arden 3 (London: Methuen, 2001), 71.

²⁵ "A.E. Strathmann, "The Textual Evidence for 'the School of Night'," *Modern Language Notes* 56.3 (1941), 181.

thought certainly existed during the period; indeed, diarist John Aubrey called one such influential Protestant model, Wilton House, “a college, [in which] there were so many learned and ingeniose persons.”²⁶ Home to Mary Herbert, Countess of Pembroke, sister of Sidney, patron of Spenser and Daniel (who lived there for a number of years), and close friend of Southampton and Fulke Greville, Wilton served as something of an academy for young Essexians.²⁷ Yet its “coterie ideal of the ivory tower”²⁸ offers too formal and rarefied a model to accommodate the *realpolitik* operations of Essex House, with its clusters of competing interests held together by the “centripetal pressure [of] comradeship [and] undivided loyalty” to an heroic leader.²⁹ If the Essex faction was more than a school, it was also less than a political party. Although the gladiatorial two-party system characteristic of post-Restoration English democracies can be traced back to York and Tudor factionalism,³⁰ ideological positions between the late Elizabethan factions were often overlapping, policy was personality driven, and strategies focused largely on re-negotiating proximity to the monarch; “who’s in, who’s out,” as Lear would have it, among “the pacts and sects of great ones” (*King Lear* 5.3.15-18).³¹ I favor replacing the hierarchically fixed, overly concretized pedagogical metaphor or the codified party

²⁶ Qtd. in Cecil Seronsy, *Samuel Daniel* (New York: Twayne, 1967), 20-21.

²⁷ This phrase comes from Daniel’s Dedicating *A Defence of Ryme* (1603) to Mary Pembroke’s son, William; Daniel also called Wilton, his “best schoole”; *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Samuel Daniel*, ed. A.B. Grosart, 5 vols (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), 4:36.

²⁸ Michel v.

²⁹ Robert Shephard, “Court Factions in Early Modern England,” *Journal of Modern History* 64.4 (1992), 733-34.

³⁰ Shephard 722.

³¹ In “Faction, Clientage, and Party: English Politics between, 1530-1603,” *History Today* 32 (1982), Simon Adams describes the Essex faction as “a coalition of outs,” 38.

structure with the more fluid, less prescriptive formulation characterized by the geometric, cosmological figure of the circle. Such a model is more appropriate to an increasingly de-centered conception of court interactions and, I suggest, makes space for the factional writer.

Summarizing recent gestures to complicate the traditional view of horizontal, top-down interactions between the monarch, his or her courtiers, and the various interested parties they represented, Natalie Mears concludes that, “Tudor politics are increasingly defined as based on social networks rather than institutional bodies, making issues of access to, and intimacy with, the monarch central.” Mears considers the work of J.A.W. Gunn especially “sensitive and productive” in affording the courtier or “client” far greater agency in the binary than has been traditionally assumed.³² Gunn’s assertion that “interactions between a king and his servants reflected initiatives taken by each in response to those of the other”³³ surely applies to an Essex faction that attempted to replicate, even to expand upon, the royal bureaucratic machine. As G.B. Harrison notes, “Essex House was almost a European court in miniature,”³⁴ while the operations of its thirty or so secretaries far outreached the expectations placed on First Secretary Cecil’s functionaries.³⁵ Along with stewards, agents, and factotums, these secretaries comprised a

³² Natalie Mears, “Courts, Courtiers, and Culture in Tudor England,” *The Historical Journal* 46.3 (2003), 703.

³³ Steven Gunn, “The Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (1995), 90.

³⁴ G.B. Harrison, *The Life and Death of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex* (London: Cassell, 1937), 37.

³⁵ For a full discussion of the relative sophistication of Essex’s bureaucracy, see Paul E.J. Hammer, “The Earl of Essex, Fulke Greville, and the Employment of Scholars,” *Studies in Philology* 91.2 (1994), 167-80; and “The Use of Scholarship: The Secretariat of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex, c. 1585-1601,” *The English Historical Review*

subset of professional “servants” who, while they lacked social freedom, enjoyed compensatory levels of intimacy with their patron. Robert Shephard defines two further subcategories of clients: a patron’s friends -- near-equals, relations by birth or marriage, political co-operators, and, especially in Essex’s case, military veterans -- who offered support and advice; and followers, a broad and diverse grouping whose members, according to Bacon, “ought to challenge no higher conditions than countenance, recommendation and protection from wrongs.”³⁶

Despite the circular model’s greater flexibility, there still seems little space -- or at least a fixed place -- in its system of overlapping concentric interests for culture, for the writer, and most particularly for the playwright and his “plastic” arts. Mears finds this absence particularly striking considering the widely acknowledged “importance of classical and Renaissance traditions [upon] the political, cultural, and intellectual” thinking of early modern statesmen intent on refashioning themselves in the public eye,³⁷ and who presumably would benefit from the expertise of the master image makers of their day: the playwrights. Yet fixing the role of dramatic poets and therefore defining their place within the factional circle is fraught with complications and uncertainty. One critical and enduring problem, of course, is figuring out how to read performances that were immediate and evanescent, left little record of reaction from a patron or audience, and whose printed texts did not necessarily reflect the production. Another is trying to

109.430 (1994), 26-51.

³⁶ Shephard 726-28; and Francis Bacon, “Of Followers and Friends,” in *The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, 14 vols (London: Longman, 1874), 6.480.

³⁷ Mears 710. Mears refers here to the Stephen Greenblatt’s seminal work of New Historicism, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980).

conceive where the author, always something of an opportunistic social migrant, might fit into the web of patron-client relations. When major faction leaders like Sidney and Raleigh were also famed poets and historians, their interactions with professional peers inevitably muddled social divisions. Indisputably, if not indefinitely, both Shakespeare and Daniel enjoyed significant friendships with their artistic patrons, Southampton and Mountjoy, and on occasion these connections must have pulled them toward the very center of the faction and into close proximity with Essex himself, either directly or mediated through his intimates. Moreover, while the factions were doubtless held together by self-interest as much as by ideology, evaluating the mutual benefits of the patron-author relationship is a complex business. At least with regard to the authors I focus on this study, money was rarely sought, let alone advanced; protection was flouted by increasingly provocative works, and could hardly have been expected once the patron was dead; and the writings were full of personal criticism and political critiques amplified by their public formats. Rarely doctrinal, more or less independent, always in motion, Essex's factional writers present moving targets to today's scholars as they once did to the contemporary censor.

In order to understand how the factional author was able to operate semi-autonomously and semi-visibly within a faction, I propose to complicate the metaphor of the circle, to make it both three-dimensional and elliptical. For Daniel, client functionality is a matter of mechanics and relativity. In *Philotas*, the Persian courtesan Thais defines herself as one of numerous little wheels in the engine of state:

For this great motion of the State we see
Doth turn on many wheelles, and some (thogh smal)
Do yet the greater move, who in degree

Stirre those who likewise turne the great'st of all.
(*Philotas* 2.2.983-86)

That Daniel perceived discomfiting connections between Thais' second oldest profession and that of a court writer is suggested in a letter he wrote to Sir Thomas Egerton, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, around the same time as *Philotas*, in which he employs the same metaphor to describe his ambitions for the *Civil Wars* and his resulting career. In "theas frames of motions," he writes, "little wheeles move the greater, and so by degrees turne about the whole. And god knows what so pore a Muse as myne may worke uppon the affections of men."³⁸ While John Pitcher notes that, "No Elizabethan [...] could have described himself as a machined ratchet or cogwheel, turning out a history of civil war, without smelling the oil, and hearing the spin, whirr and clatter of the court revolving on itself,"³⁹ Daniel's metaphor also acknowledges the vital power of the apparently minor, barely visible cog in the mighty court or factional machine. Small matters.

What Daniel's simile doesn't capture -- and he might very well have felt uncomfortable adopting the Copernican premise that I employ here -- is the constantly varying trajectory of the factional writer. While I acknowledge that professional careers and political relations are neither menstrual nor diurnal, throughout this thesis I conceive of the authors as operating in the more remote reaches of an Essex solar system, and yet aware that their impact was felt across that system and beyond. While, broadly speaking, these authors sought to give the faction and its head a voice and a personality, they also seemed intent on generating internal monologues, a series of humanistic interventions

³⁸ Daniel's letter to Egerton, the original of which was only recently discovered in the library of the Duke of Sutherland, is transcribed in John Pitcher, "Samuel Daniel's Letter to Sir Thomas Egerton," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 47.1 (1984), 56-57.

³⁹ Pitcher, "Samuel Daniel's Letter to Sir Thomas Egerton" 59.

that promoted and broadcast a sense of self-education, aspiration, and political modernity. In the terms of the heliocentric metaphor, moreover, client-satellites not only orbited the central body of Essex in elliptical trajectories, their gravitational pulls also inflected the paths of their fellow satellites. On occasion, their writing and connections brought them together: Daniel and Shakespeare might well have met at Wilton in the early 1590s; Daniel probably discussed the licensing of *Bussy D'Ambois* with Chapman at the Blackfriars in late 1603. Sometimes, as with Chapman and Shakespeare, they might even have attempted to eclipse one another. Generally, however, they seem to have remained remote bodies, cooperating at a safe distance both from Essex and from each other.

2. Critical conversations

How these authors communicated with one another, and how the music of their particular spheres was heard and by whom, are the central inquiries of this thesis. Although the historicists of the early twentieth century first posed these questions, little progress has been made in answering them; the scholarly conversation on factional writers that culminated in Bradbrook's 1936 *School of Night* went almost silent for four decades. Following the Second World War, a school of New Criticism intent on making available an anthologized canon of great works to a growing student body heralded the democratization of literary studies in America. On the other side of the Atlantic, F.R. Leavis' promotion of close reading, although driven by different cultural and critical imperatives, had an effect similar to that of New Criticism: both movements favored

textual analysis over historical context.⁴⁰ Throughout the mid-twentieth century, consequently, literary scholars showed little interest in radicalizing early modern authors, let alone in characterizing them as political activists or confederates, choosing instead to focus on their formal, aesthetic, and philosophical significance. Through his dubious claim that Chapman was the first metaphysical poet,⁴¹ T.S. Eliot introduced the obscurantist author to a new generation in search of transcendental and universal truths, and in the 1950s Chapman found favor among critics like Elias Schwartz who sought to understand the ethics and morality of his arcane poems and earlier plays. Yet aside from *Bussy*, Chapman's politically motivated French tragedies were, and largely remain, unregarded, while his possible factional interactions with Shakespeare continue to provoke anxiety and antagonism even among today's scholars.⁴² In the 1960s, Daniel certainly benefited from moves in the scholarly community to return the universal Shakespeare to his place among influential peers; Cecil Seronsy, in particular, uncovered an enduring pattern of interactions between Daniel and Shakespeare spanning almost two decades that, among other things, helped date *Richard II*. Yet again, however, the critical

⁴⁰ F.R. Leavis, *New Bearings in Critical Poetry* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1932). Although a pre-war publication, *New Bearings*' major impact was felt following its re-release in 1946.

⁴¹ T.S. Eliot, "The Metaphysical Poets," *Selected Essays* (London: Faber and Faber, 1932), 241-50. Whether or not Chapman should be considered a metaphysical poet, Matthew Stevens argues that Eliot was influenced by the amalgamation of Christian philosophy and Senecan ethics that "enabled [Chapman] to propose how thought and ideas might be engaged with in lyric and dramatic verse, how poetry might be made to 'refer outside' itself to more abstract intellectual issues"; see "T.S. Eliot's Chapman: 'Metaphysical' Poetry and Beyond" *Journal of Modern Literature* 29.4 (2006), 23.

⁴² See, for instance, H.R. Woudhuysen, ed. *Love's Labour's Lost*, Arden 3 (London: Methuen, 2001), 66-72; Rene Weis, ed. *Henry IV, Part 2* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998), 33-37; and Charles S. Forker, ed. *Richard II*, Arden 3 (London: Methuen, 2002), 10-12.

biographers who fed on this flurry of interest, most notably Charlotte Spivak and Joan Rees, vociferously rejected Laurence Michel and Brent Stirling's Essexian readings of *Philotas*, which, according to Rees, turned Daniel's play into "a common piece of propaganda."⁴³

We might expect that the emergence of the new historicism in the early 1980s would have reignited the factional conversation. Probably still the dominant critical movement in early modern scholarship, new historicism not only re-contextualized authors in their cultural, economic, intellectual, and spiritual marketplaces, but expanded the web of intertextual determinants exponentially to include a whole range of sub-literary texts and artifacts, a melting pot of shaping forces. Yet the movement's Foucauldian underpinning, which posits power as the source of human activity and texts (and stages) as enduring sites where power is contested, paradoxically strips authors of much of their political agency. In post-feudal, early capitalist English society, Stephen Greenblatt has persuasively argued, any kind of oppositional or transgressive text, written with authorized tools, communicated in sanctioned spaces, and employing the very practices it condemns or desires, ultimately contains its own subversion; it maintains the status quo and the author's own fragile place within it. "Monolithic power," writes Greenblatt, "not only produces its own subversion but is actively built upon it."⁴⁴ By offering critiques of

⁴³ Joan Rees, *Samuel Daniel: A Critical and Biographical Study* (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1964): 101-2, reacts to Brent Stirling's essay, "Daniel's *Philotas* and the Essex Case," *Modern Language Quarterly* 3 (1942): 583-94, and Michel's introduction to *The Tragedy of Philotas* (1949). See also Charlotte Spivak, *George Chapman* (New York: Twayne 1967).

⁴⁴ Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988), 30.

Essex that ultimately reinforce his “megalopsyché”⁴⁵ and political magnanimity, the factional authors in this study demonstrate this dictum. And yet the new historicist version of commercially driven patronage, which operates as a “power circuit, with art reduced to ‘cash for propaganda’,” tends to ignore or discard ideologically, or at least independently motivated literature “produced by the professional writers whose dependency on a patronus was either sporadic or non-existent.”⁴⁶ In their various careers as a professor of jurisprudence, a playwright, a theatrical producer, and, in Daniel’s case, a poet who spread his financial risk across a portfolio of patrons, none of the writers in this study could be considered dependents of Essex: yet they elected to write for the Essex circle, and even to promote the posthumous Essex persona. The new historicist agenda (such as it is) struggles to accommodate, and therefore to acknowledge, the role of the factional writer in the patronic system.

Between the end of the Second World War and the late 1980s, only the historians -- in particular, the historiographers writing on the history of history and its evolving function and style -- seemed willing to consider the politically implicated association between early modern poets and historians. Describing the brief period before Sir Philip Sidney’s “famous distinctions” drove apart the disciplines of history and poetry, F.J. Levy’s seminal work *Tudor Historical Thought* (1967) recognized the significant contribution of the dramatists in particular in formulating a politicized historiography affiliated with other Essexian writers. “Organized history, which became much more

⁴⁵ Mervyn James, *Society, Politics and Culture* (Cambridge: CUP, 1986), 416.

⁴⁶ M.D. Jardine, “New Historicism for Old: New Conservatism for Old?: The Politics of Patronage in the Renaissance,” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991), 290.

common with the ‘politic’ historians, appeared first in the theater,” Levy wrote, “and Sir John Hayward and Lord Bacon, two of its principal opponents, were well aware of the fact.”⁴⁷ This said, it took Levy, perhaps influenced by the historicist revival and the determination of literary scholars like Paulina Kewes to break down the “disciplinary divisions between history and literary studies,” another two decades to acknowledge that the politic historians of the period were factional.⁴⁸ In “Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England,” which opens notably with a reference to the commissioning of Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, Levy discusses collectively the “small group of men [including Greville, Bacon, Cuffe, and Daniel] associated with the Earl of Essex, who, linked by a common intellectual background and a common political experience, created a new, English politic history.”⁴⁹ As a consequence of this interdisciplinary détente, the historian Blair Worden, crafting the political syllogism that defines the factional writer, recently wrote that, “Poets were not only historians but political thinkers; for most political thought was also historical thought.” As Worden concludes, “Much is missed when historical and literary writing are viewed apart.”⁵⁰

⁴⁷ F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1967), 233. Levy challenged the prevailing orthodoxy, as articulated by F. Smith Fussner, that the late Tudor history players were simply entertainers, while, other than the “notable stylists” Raleigh and Bacon, “writers of history were not concerned with the literary value of their works”; see *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (New York: Columbia UP, 1962), xxi.

⁴⁸ Paulina Kewes, “History and its Uses,” *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.1/2 (2005), 3.

⁴⁹ F.J. Levy, “Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 50.1 (1987), 3.

⁵⁰ Blair Worden, “Historians and Poets,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.1/2 (2005), 72 and 84.

While historians like D.R. Woolf appreciate the influence of humanist rhetoric on the “elegant political narratives” that emerged from the late Elizabethan historiography,⁵¹ what remains absent from the historiographers’ commentaries is analysis of authorial intention behind the rhetoric and its reception. For this kind of literary speculation, we must turn to a subset of historicists who, from the mid-1980s, began to consider the neglected issue of theatrical censorship in the early modern period. Because “dramatic censorship,” writes Janet Clare in *Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority*, ‘is inevitably linked with local circumstances at the time of performance,’ the “empirical approach” required to assess the numerous instances of censorship not only locates them at the heart of the political moment, but also -- although Clare seems hesitant to pursue this point -- places them in dialogue with both their persecutors and their fellow “victims.”⁵² Although Richard Dutton, in *Mastering the Revels*, acknowledges this dialogue, he privilege the censors’ abilities as “strong readers” over the authors’ prudential tactics.⁵³ Only Annabel Patterson’s *Censorship and Interpretation*, it seems to me, appreciates the full extent and complexity of the exchange, or rather the interchange, between and among censors and authors. Her theory of “functional ambiguity,” in which the “indeterminacy inveterate to language was fully and knowingly exploited by authors and readers alike, [including] those who were most in control,” presupposes the development of “strategies

⁵¹ D.R. Wolfe, "Community, Law and State: Samuel Daniel's Historical Thought Revisited," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 49.1 (1988), 14.

⁵² Janet Clare, *Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990), xii.

⁵³ Richard Dutton, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1991), 122.

of indirection” via a “sophisticated system of oblique communication.”⁵⁴ Although Patterson describes this discourse as a set of “unwritten rules,” much of this codification was, of course, written and communicated intertextually. Politic authors learnt from each other and from the reactions, written or otherwise, of equally well-read censors. Patterson, I suggest, determined the means by which factions might talk among, to, and about each other via their writers.

While neither the historiographers writing on politic history nor the historicists writing of its censorship were necessarily concerned with the political imperatives behind their examined texts, their distinct lines of study, once they converge, begin to provide a sense of how the literary circle of the Essex faction defined and promoted itself, and how it was perceived and received. To understand why a literary phenomenon was so intrinsic to the Essex faction, and proved so provocative to the authorities, some idea of the material conditions and intellectual environment in and under which the factional writers operated is essential. In the following sections, I consider how the relationship between the author and the censor contributed to the production of factional literature, and then turn to the impact of the Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus on the political thinking of the Essex faction.

⁵⁴ Annabel Patterson, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1991), 18 and 45.

3. “A Game of Cat-and-Mouse”⁵⁵

This thesis is constructed on the principle that, considering the challenges of interpreting the “hermeneutics of censorship” and its evasions during the early modern period, any evaluation of an author’s factional affiliations ought to consider texts in relation not only to their political contexts but also to their intertexts -- their relationship to other writings that experienced similar accusations or interference. The authors in this study invariably exploited their diversity -- their strength in isolation -- to dismiss accusations of writing to, or in support of, a factional agenda as circumstantial or retroactive, charges trumped up by a paranoid administration. In an early modern culture that promoted didacticism as a literary paradigm, it is certainly tempting to question the intentionality behind much of the politically determined readings of early modern texts. As Leah Marcus writes, of plays in particular: “Given the feckless, highly ingenious, almost ungovernable gusto with which contemporaries found parallels between stage action and contemporary events, there are few things that plays could be ruled upon *not* to mean.”⁵⁶

There is, however, a rich vein of recent scholarship on state censorship, as both a repressive act and a productive pressure on the writing and reception of early modern texts, that suggests that these protestations of authorial innocence should be treated with skepticism. In *Censorship and Interpretation*, Patterson discerns the presence of a “cultural code” in texts dealing with politically and socially sensitive issues that allowed

⁵⁵ For this description of the ongoing relations between censors and writers in the early modern period, see Annabel Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's 'Chronicles'* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1994), 48.

⁵⁶ Leah Marcus, *Puzzling Shakespeare; Local Reading and its Discontents* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988), 27.

“writers [to] communicate with readers or audiences (among whom were the very same authorities who were responsible for state censorship) without producing a direct confrontation.”⁵⁷ Although Clare, whose *‘Art made tongue tied by authority’* focuses specifically on theatrical censorship in the era, argues that the playwright, “communicating with an unhomogenous audience,” couldn’t rely on such oblique tactics and had “to be more audacious than the [prose] writer,”⁵⁸ she nonetheless agrees that early modern readers and audiences were as keen to decipher texts as writers were to encode them and censors to expose them. The consequent game of cat-and-mouse became a part of the prevailing literary culture.

The common tactic of the mouse in this game was to blame the cat for misreading authorial intention. As Sarah A. Kelen points out, even the orthodox historians working under the Holinshed banner to produce their history of England and Scotland (1577, 1587) diverted blame and criticism for potentially subversive readings onto the readers themselves with their “perpetual parentheses: ‘It is dangerous (gentle reader).’”⁵⁹ Drawing on safer providential models like Holinshed as a camouflage for more subversive historical readings, Daniel likewise puts the onus on the reader of his *Civil Wars*, leaving “things to their own Fame, and the Censure to the Reader, as being his part rather than mine, who am onely to recite things done, not to rule them.”⁶⁰ In sharing the

⁵⁷ Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1988), 45.

⁵⁸ Janet Clare, *‘Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority’: Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990), xii-xiii.

⁵⁹ Sarah A. Kelen, “Censorship, Holinshed’s Chronicle, and the Politics of Control,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27.3 (1996), 707.

⁶⁰ Grosart 4.83.

“work of doing history with the reader,” writes Alzada Tipton, Daniel “builds himself a defense against those who would find the message of his history subversive.”⁶¹

Such self-denials also, of course, advertise the very presence of what the author denies. In the Epilogue to *2 Henry IV*, the actor who likely played Sir John Falstaff, alluding to the censoring of his prior title of Sir John Oldcastle, Lollard ancestor to Essex’s factional rival Lord Cobham, assures the audience of his reappearance in *Henry V*, “unless already [Falstaff] be killed with your hard opinions; for Oldcastle died a martyr, and this is not the man” (*2H4* Epil. 30-32). Shakespeare’s uncharacteristically brazen allusion, fanning factional flames rather than dampening them, consigned Falstaff to an offstage sickbed and an early death in the second tetralogy’s culminating play. Yet for Shakespeare the sacrifice (if such it was) seems to have been worth it. Implicitly encouraging what it explicitly discourages, Shakespeare’s epilogue provokes the audience to consider how a two-part dramatization of a fifteenth-century history of Henry IV might speak to the modern factional dispute between the Cobham-Cecil-Raleigh faction and Henry’s celebrated descendent, the Earl of Essex. Shakespeare promotes an enduring factional interpretation among his departing spectators, and in the process kills off one of his most beloved characters.

Citing a local response to Hayward’s dangerous dedication, Patterson notes that the sophisticated hermeneutics of censorship should not, however, be confused with the deciphering of hidden runes that exercised so many early twentieth-century historicist

⁶¹ See Alzada Tipton, Caught between 'Virtue' and 'Memorie': Providential and Political Historiography in Samuel Daniel's *The Civil Wars*, *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 61.3/4 (1998), 341.

scholars. In early March 1599, hot on the release of Hayward's *Life and Raigne of Henrie IIII*, John Chamberlain wrote in one of his gossipy letters to Dudley Carleton, of the

many exceptions taken [to it], especially to the epistle which was a short thing in Latin dedicated to the erle of Essex. [Although] there was a commuandement yt shold be cut out of the booke, yet I have got you a transcript of yt, that you may picke out the offence yf you can; for my part I can finde no such buggeswordes, but that everything is as yt is taken.⁶²

Having acquired a banned book because of its reputed sedition, Chamberlain set about attempting to discover its “buggeswordes” -- terms no longer meant to terrify or threaten (*OED* n.1), but to thrill -- doubly encoded in Hayward's Latin dedication. Having failed in his efforts, Chamberlain then challenged his friend to do a better job -- “picke out the offence yf you can” -- while conceding that not all meaning is recoverable or provable: “everything is as yt is taken.” As Patterson concludes, “Chamberlain and his contemporaries could combine a practical recognition of the indeterminacy of the text in a culture governed by censorship with an equally pragmatic recognition that behind each text stood an author, whose intentions it was the reader's [or spectator's] responsibility to try to discern.”⁶³ This “functional ambiguity” within the text and between text and reader,⁶⁴ while it cultivates our sensitivity to subtext, should caution us against reading texts as blatant allegories freighted with exact correspondences and fixed significations waiting to be unlocked by the right key. Over-determined reading is, after all, how Ben Jonson, in the Induction to *Bartholemew Fair* (1614), pillories “the state-decipherer or

⁶² *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 vols, ed. Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939), 1.70.

⁶³ Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation* 48.

⁶⁴ Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation* 18

politic picklock of the scene,” the professional censor whose main purpose was to entrap authors rather than understand them.⁶⁵

Jonson’s long record of censorious infringements spanning thirty-five years and six plays reminds us that this cat-and-mouse game was sometimes played for the highest stakes.⁶⁶ While Cremutius Cordus, the Roman historian tried for his “oblique” attack on Tiberius in Jonson’s *Sejanus his Fall* (1603), might earn greater “authority [and] an eternal name” from the “cruelite / Of interdictions” brought against him,⁶⁷ direct authorial challenges to the authorities risked more than the dismemberment of their texts. In 1579, Puritan pamphleteer John Stubbs lost the hand that wrote against the Queen’s marriage to Alençon, the Duc d’Anjou in *The Discovery of a Gaping Gulf whereunto England is like to be swallowed by another French Marriage, if the Lord forbid not the banns, by letting her Majesty see the sin and punishment thereof*. Twenty years later, Elizabeth, who had been dissuaded from passing the death sentence on Stubbs, once again threatened the life of an author, demanding that Hayward be racked to produce the real author behind *Life and Raigne of Henrie IIII*; Francis Bacon, by joking with the Queen that Hayward’s only felony was his plagiarism of Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus, credited himself with saving the young lawyer.⁶⁸ In 1605, Chapman and Jonson, co-authors with John Marston of *Eastward Ho!*, were imprisoned for “writting something against the Scots,” and their

⁶⁵ *Ben Jonson*, ed. Herford and Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford: OUP, 1954), 4.333.

⁶⁶ Jonson was imprisoned for his authorial share in *The Isle of Dogs* (1597) and *Eastward Ho!* (1605); cited before the Lord Chief Justice for *Poetaster* (1601) and *The Devil is an Ass* (1616); summoned before the Privy Council for *Sejanus* (1603); and cited before the Court of High Commission as late as 1632. For details, see Herford and Simpson 11.253.

⁶⁷ *Sejanus*, ed. Jonas A Barish (New Haven: Connecticut: Yale UP, 1965), 4:408.

⁶⁸ Spedding 10:139-62.

plethora of anxious letters to patrons and powerful advocates suggests they took seriously “the report that they should then had their ears cutt and noses.”⁶⁹ With his previous record of infringements, Chapman’s flight to Scotland in 1608 during the *Byron* scandal was clearly more than precautionary. While casual sleuths like Chamberlain obviously enjoyed their literary egg hunts, the authors -- especially those intruding on issues of prerogative or internecine politics -- risked dismemberment of their bodies as well as of their texts. This thesis will consider the ideological and political impulses that encouraged even prudent authors like Shakespeare and Daniel to confront banned issues (staging the Irish question in *Henry V*, Shakespeare risked the death penalty) and royal prerogative: performing the anti-absolutist *Philotas* at a royal performance, Daniel sabotaged his chance of royal favor in a new Jacobean administration. These authors were clearly seeking, and risking, something more than better ticket and book sales.

While evidence of censorship offers a clarifying perspective on the ongoing tensions among text, performance, and state intervention, the rubric is not infallible. The politically motivated author faces a particular challenge in producing work that is legible enough to be effective, yet slippery enough to avoid censure. Whenever a text or its author succumbs to interference -- even if, as with Daniel’s *Civil Wars* and Shakespeare’s *Henry V*, that intervention may have been self-imposed -- by implication, presumably, the mouse has lost the game. Posterity has left us, in other words, to study works that failed in a key objective -- they got caught. Interrogating the apparent paradox, this thesis also considers works that escaped the censor’s attentions yet whose affiliations emerge within

⁶⁹ *Conversations of William Drummond with Ben Jonson at Hawthornden*, ed. Philip Sidney (London: Gay and Bird, 1900), 32.

the broader network of factional production: Chapman's translation of Homer's *Iliad* (1598) and *Bussy d'Ambois* (1603), while betraying no evidence of interference, contributed to the reception of subsequent seditious material. Yet in my analysis of Shakespeare's political affiliations, by focusing on plays with (as I suggest) Essexian subtexts that were *not* censored, I put particular pressure on two assumptions: the innocence of unrestricted texts and the factional ineptitude of expurgated material. In my discussion of *I Henry IV*, a play that largely confounded the censor despite its pronounced factionalism, I hope to reveal both the apotheosis of Shakespeare's evasive strategy of oblique allusion and his conscious exposing of it in subsequent plays (*2 Henry IV* and *Henry V*), remounts (*Richard II*), and revisions (*Hamlet*), to suggest that an author's agency extends to both self-concealment and controlled self-revelation. Evaluating the political intentionality behind the authors' rhetorical strategies in their overt and implicit battles with the censors, I hope therefore to demonstrate that in this game the cats did not hold all the trump cards.

4. Tacitus and Essex

As Bacon implied, the "buggeswordes" Chamberlain sought in Hayward's historiography were almost certainly Tacitean. The Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus (AD 56-117), whose antipathy toward the early Christians and anti-monarchical politics left him sidelined by the scholars of the middle ages,⁷⁰ enjoyed a continental revival in

⁷⁰ Tacitus records one of the earliest secular references to Christ, who "suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilatus"; *The Annales of Cornelius Tacitus*, trans. Richard Grenaway (London, 1598), 15.44.

the early sixteenth century, and his politic analyses of classical republicanism versus autocratic imperialism were incorporated into the works of fellow Florentine historians and political philosophers Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527) and Francesco Guicciardini (1483-1540): these associations made him both admired and feared by the English political establishment. Esteemed for his radical condensation of historical material, his laconic epigrammatic style, and his professed non-partizanship -- “my purpose is to relate [...] without either anger or zeal, motives from which I am far removed” (*Annals* 1.1) -- Tacitus offered trenchant critiques of the reigns of Tiberius (AD 14-37) and Nero (54-68) in early imperial Rome, whose tyrannies were seen to parallel the tumultuous political conflicts between and among the Italian city-states, the papacy, and persistent foreign intrusions. “The Italians had lost their liberty,” writes F.J. Levy, “and with it their historians lost their liberty.”⁷¹ Delving into the workings of the state, exposing the psychological impulses behind political actions, and developing maxims for both surviving and exploiting current events, the Tacitean, or ‘politic’ historians, “left their posts as observers and stepped into the arena”⁷²: they became freedom fighters.

What these scholar-warriors offered was political instruction founded on the notion of man’s constant nature, which rendered history cyclical and repetitive rather than linear and progressive, and favored secular skepticism over divine providence. Locating and analyzing repeated patterns of behavior in past events, the historian could fashion lessons for contemporary rulers and, more contentiously, offer advice on how to shape their futures. Through the study of history, wrote French jurist and political

⁷¹ F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1967), 242.

⁷² Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 251.

philosopher Jean Bodin (1530-96), "not only are present day affairs readily interpreted but also future events are inferred, and we acquire reliable maxims for what we should seek and avoid."⁷³ History became a training ground for political theorists and a seminary for their political masters. The Tacitean revival, then, was a determinedly pragmatic movement defined by its claims to political utility. Politic history, we might say, had little time for nostalgia; it looked back only to see how better to move forward.

Through his majestic translation, *Opera umnia* (1581), Belgian humanist Justus Lipsius introduced his friend Sir Philip Sidney to Tacitus as "an useful and a great Writer [...] who ought to be in their hands who have the steering of the Common-wealth and Government."⁷⁴ Appealing to the erudite, aristocratic, yet inherently dissident Leicester-Sidney-Herbert conglomerate gathering at the militantly Protestant counter court of Wilton, Tacitus and politic history "were idle, if exciting adventures" during the 1580s. Yet, Levy continues, "When Essex became ascendant, so did the Taciteans."⁷⁵ Surrounding himself with politic advisors like Francis Bacon and Henry Cuffe, who discussed history's lessons with him, keeping "a paper booke of [...] notations by Cornelius Tacitus,"⁷⁶ applying the historian's lessons to help him understand complex issues of French politics,⁷⁷ Essex also patronized writers who promoted this new 'politic' historiography and developed its rhetoric of pattern, protest, and expectation. During this

⁷³ Jean Bodin, *The Six Bookes of a CommonWeale. Written by J. Bodin a Famous Lawyer, and a Man of Great Experience in Matters of State. Out of the French and Latine Copies, Done into English, by Richard Knolles* (London, 1606), 10.

⁷⁴ Quoted by Alan T. Bradford in "Stuart Absolutism and the Utility of Tacitus," *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 46.2 (1983), 128.

⁷⁵ Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 251.

⁷⁶ Ironically, Cobham, Essex's factional enemy, borrowed this book from Sir Robert Cotton's library in 1603; for details, see Hammer, *Polarization of Politics*, 308.

⁷⁷ Hammer, *Polarization of Politics*, 309-15.

period, notes Levy, “policy, practice, maxim and aphorism were words treated with suspicion,” as were the historians’ promises of “lively patterns” both for “private directions and for affayres of state.”⁷⁸

Among the “small group of men linked by a common intellectual background and a common political experience [who] created the new English political history,” Levy includes Fulke Greville and Samuel Daniel from the Wilton circle, Tacitean translator Sir Henry Savile and (more casually) the antiquarian Sir John Chamberlain from the universities, and the civil lawyer John Hayward, who, although he is clearly not of the clique, gets honorable mention for writing the first politic English history.⁷⁹ Yet again the professional dramatists in this thesis are politically sidelined. Shakespeare’s histories, writes Blair Worden, “reveal none of the appetite for barbed or political allusion which characterizes so much of the drama of his time”: Levy broadly agrees. “Oddly enough, little was made of policy in the history plays with an English setting,”⁸⁰ he concludes, consigning Elizabethan historical dramaturgy to the heavy moralizing of the providential chronicles. For Alan T. Bradford, as for Levy, “the link between the politic historians and the dramatists” (by which Bradford means professional as opposed to coterie playwrights like Daniel and Greville) was obviously Ben Jonson, whose 1603 staging of *Sejanus his*

⁷⁸ Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 240. Hayward’s dedicatory promises quoted here in “A.P. to the Reader,” A3-A4^v, are replicated throughout the Tacitean literature of the period; see Manning 63.

⁷⁹ Levy, “Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England,” *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 50.1 (1987), 3.

⁸⁰ Blair Worden, “Shakespeare in Life and Art: Biography and *Richard II*,” in *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*, eds. Takashi Tozuka and J. R. Mulryne (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 30; and Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 229.

Fall at the Globe included Shakespeare in its cast.⁸¹ Drawing heavily on Richard Grenway's translation of the *Annals*, which he considered "ignorantly done,"⁸² and filling in a hiatus in the Tacitus manuscript, Jonson's dramatization of the downfall of Tiberius' favorite general in 31 AD fed into the increasing skepticism of the age, notes Bradford, and "unlocked the *Annals* as a source for Stuart drama."⁸³ Jonson's austere and unforgiving play did not, however, unlock Tacitus for his audience who, by his own admission, rejected *Sejanus* vociferously,⁸⁴ and his subsequent reaction to the "cult" of Tacitus suggests that he judged the public no more capable of appreciating his play than they were of understanding the inner workings of state.

For both Levy and Bradford, it seems, dramatic Taciteanism in England was confined to classical material played (with little success) on post-Elizabethan stages in front of minority, highly educated audiences.⁸⁵ I propose to interrogate this elite

⁸¹ An endnote in the Folio text (1616) includes the original cast list.

⁸² In *Conversations with Drummond*, 149, in which he offered this judgment, Jonson claims to have translated the entire oration of Cremetius Cordus the historian directly out of Tacitus.

⁸³ Alan T. Bradford, "Stuart Absolutism, and the 'Utility' of Tacitus," *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 46.2 (1983), 135. Over the following three decades, notes Bradford, 153, the stage featured every emperor save Caligula (who is part of the MS hiatus) covered by Tacitus' *Annals* (14 AD - 68): the two anonymous plays, *The Tragedy of Tiberius* (1607) and *The Tragedy of Nero* (1624), Thomas May's *Julia Agrippina, Empress of Rome* (1628), and Nathanael Richards' *The Tragedy of Messalina, the Roman Empress* (1634-36).

⁸⁴ In his dedication to Lord Aubigny (who sheltered Chapman from the *Byron* contention five years later), Jonson writes that *Sejanus* "is a poem, that (if I well remember) in your Lo. sight suffer'd no lesse violence from our people here, then the subject of it did from the rage of the people of Rome," *The Workes of Benjamin Jonson*, (London, 1616), 357.

⁸⁵ Of the playwrights Levy and Bradford consider Tacitean, Daniel wrote *Cleopatra* (1594 and 1607) as well as *Philotas* (1605), Greville drafted *Antony and Cleopatra* (c.1600), while *Poetaster* (1601) and *Catiline* (1611) demonstrated Jonson's continued interest in Roman history.

perspective by taking Tacitus out of the study and private salon and consider his impact upon the public stages of the Globe and the Blackfriars theaters. As late as 2005, Paulina Kewes complained that, “the drama’s contribution to the transformations in the ways history was written and used has gone largely unrecognized.”⁸⁶ If we accept her premise, then the reverse should also be true. By reading the dramatic historiographies of Hayward, Shakespeare, Daniel, and Chapman through the Tacitean lens employed by the Essex faction, we develop a sense of the profound ways in which the historical and dramatic disciplines both influenced one another and contributed commensurately to the political life of late Tudor and early Stuart London.

5. The ‘politic’ history players

This thesis is broadly bipartite in structure: its first two chapters focus mainly on Elizabethan texts affiliated with the prelapsarian Essex that exploit the allusive potential of England’s chronicles; the later chapters examine notions of a posthumous Essex represented in Jacobean plays set in classical or continental history. My opening chapter on Hayward, a prose historian and homiletic pamphleteer with no interest in playwriting, foregrounds the transaction between prose and dramatic historiographies while considering how Shakespeare and Daniel, dramatic poets with an investment in history and known Essex affiliations, influenced Hayward’s politic writing. During this period, poets and historians of a humanistic bent “advanced common claims as arbiters of political conduct,” notes Worden, while believing it their duty to educate, sometimes

⁸⁶ Kewes, "History and Its Uses," 4-5.

even “to shame their princely and aristocratic readers.”⁸⁷ Yet Hayward’s popular *Life and Raigne of Henrie III* sought a broader audience and, I shall argue, looked to the public stage for guidance on how to reach it. I examine the various ways in which Hayward blends Tacitean analysis with Shakespeare’s dramatic sensibility, to stock his narrative with rich, idiosyncratic personalities shaped by multiple, sometimes contradictory, causes. For Hayward, political action assumed something of the complexity of psychological motivation and fate became a matter of choice. While Hayward applied Tacitus’ axiomatic moralizing to the English chronicles, he also recognized the theater’s capacity to animate *and* prognosticate: the twin claims that made politic history and its practitioners (Hayward hoped) indispensable to a forward-thinking politician like Essex.

In Chapter 2, I invert the mirror to consider how Tacitean principles were absorbed into the moralizing theatrical model that prevailed in late Tudor England to create what Phyllis Rackin calls “a mongrelized historiography that cheerfully mingled providential and Machiavellian explanations.” In Shakespeare’s hands, the history play was something of an “experimental genre,” Rackin notes, in which these historiographic contradictions were “projected as dramatic conflicts.”⁸⁸ While Shakespeare was not a Tacitean in a purist, Jonsonian sense -- he never drew upon Tacitus directly for his plots, or for a sententious style that was anathema to his equivocal dramaturgy -- classical scholars have detected distinct Tacitean influences within the histories.⁸⁹ I shall explore

⁸⁷ Worden, “Historians and Poets,” 83.

⁸⁸ Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare’s English Chronicles* (New York: Cornell UP, 1990), 7 and 27

⁸⁹ For a broad range of commentaries, see Robert S. Forsythe, “Tacitus, *Henry VI, Part III*, and Nero,” *Modern Language Notes* 42.1 (1927), 25-27; George R. Price, “*Henry V* and ‘Germanicus’,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 12.1 (1961), 57-60; and Herbert W.

the ways in which Shakespeare's second history cycle, and *I Henry IV* in particular, employs Tacitus' acute understanding of political psychology and psychopathy to map the various aspects of the Essexian statesman. Rather than focusing Essexian aspects in one "megalopsychē" -- in his ancestor Henry Bolingbroke, for instance -- Shakespeare, I suggest, disperses the Essex persona among several historical personalities in a manner that simultaneously catches and evades the gaze of audience and censor alike. In line with the pedagogical principles of the politic historians, Shakespeare promotes Essex's impressive political ubiquity while concurrently interrogating the implications of a governor whose many roles risk leaving him personally unbalanced and politically over-exposed.

Cherry-picked by readers for his political dicta and by playwrights for his meta-historical understanding of political character,⁹⁰ Tacitus offered an adaptive and evolving historiography to the early moderns. To understand the enduring toxicity of the posthumous Essex, I situate the post-Essex faction's literary production within the context of what Salmon terms the "Protestant form of Tacitean Neostoicism" that emerged in early Stuart England.⁹¹ On the continent, radical moderates like Justus Lipsius, responding to the growing intrusions of religious extremism and the expansion of arbitrary monarchy, synthesized Seneca's moral and stoic philosophies with Tacitus'

Benario, "Shakespeare's Debt to Tacitus' *Histories*," *Notes and Queries* 55.2 (2008), 202-5.

⁹⁰ In his seminal essay "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact," Hayden White's coins the term "meta-history" to describe the process by which both historical narratives and fictions employ similar rhetorical strategies in making meaningful past events, whether "real" or imagined; see *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Discourse* (Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1978), 98.

⁹¹ Salmon 208.

political analysis to create a practical ethos of survival within the new political reality.⁹² In the aftermath of Essex's failed uprising, aggressive withdrawal became the defining ideology of a faction in retreat. The posthumous Essex plays, I suggest, are best understood as émigrés pieces, their rhetorical audacity driven by political disappointment, ideological affront, and the presiding sense that, even from the fringes of power, their writing had the capacity to worry the center. In the third chapter, I read Daniel's *Philotas*, a play begun under Elizabeth and finished under James, as a blueprint for Tacitean Neostoicism, its dramatized debate between engagement and retreat, between silence and speaking out, expressed not only in its plot and its rhetoric, but in a compositional history that builds interruption and silence into its very structure. While *Philotas* reveals a faction under stress and its chief writer in artistic and political crisis, I shall argue that Daniel's courageous play nevertheless resurrects the champion of continental Protestantism to defend against the incursions of continental absolutism. Co-opting the dead Essex for a live issue, Daniel marks the process of metaphorization by which the historic figure is historicized. Submitting to a Tacitean procedure he had once patronized, the dead Essex becomes analogous, the former history maker rendered an historical marker.

In the final chapter, I consider Chapman's role in literary efforts to affiliate the post-Essex faction with the counter court developing around the aggressively Protestant Prince Henry in the first decade of James's reign. Although he is acknowledged for his theatrical innovation rather than for his pioneering historiography, Chapman wrote

⁹² Where Lipsius' *De Constantia* (Antwerp, 1584), which yoked Seneca's pagan stoicism to an "undogmatic Christianity," caught the tension between endurance and abstention, involvement and reclusion, his *Politics* (Leiden, 1589), drawing primarily on Tacitus, articulated his theory of *prudencia mixta*, or the necessity of *realpolitik* in government; for details, see Salmon 204.

French tragedies that develop an involved historicism that incorporates classical, continental, and local figures into analogical triforms that are nostalgic, topical, and prescient, and which encapsulate the conflicted impulses of the Neostoics: to concede, to conform, or to contend. Championed as the apotheosis of aggressive factionalism in Chapman's translation of the *Iliad* (1598), the "Achilleian" Essex pervades the titular characters of his plays, *Bussy D'Ambois* and *Byron*, feudal warriors cast adrift in the corrupt and micro-managed courts of Henri III and Henri IV. While *Bussy* seeks to rationalize heroic individualism in advocacy of a vaguely Aristotelian republicanism, in which, to quote Charles W. Kennedy, "the virtue of the individual constitutes an inner law that obviates the necessity of external rule,"⁹³ in *Byron* Chapman exposes his Senecan demigod to an acute Tacitean critique. Upon the shifting geo-political sands of post-Reformation Europe, Byron wobbles like an oversized statue (*Conspiracy* 4.1.179-205), his heroic significance revealed as a delusional myth.

Yet if *Byron* sounds a requiem for a failed faction, it also offers a telling critique of the concurrent reigns of James I and Henri IV, and on the Machiavellian underpinnings of their related brands of paternal absolutism. Hypothesizing that *Byron*'s provocation of a diplomatic incident between the English and French courts was a conscious effort by Chapman to invigorate the post-Essex dissidents gathering around Prince Henry and the 3rd earl of Essex, I suggest that Chapman retains an essential Tacitean defiance. Tacitus opens *The Histories* with the stark warning: "So long as republican history was their theme, they [historians] wrote with equal eloquence and

⁹³ Charles W. Kennedy, "Political Theory in the Plays of George Chapman," in *Essays in Dramatic Literature: The Parrott Presentation Volume*, ed. Craig Hardin (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1935), 77.

independence. Yet after the battle of Actium had been fought and the interests of peace demanded that power should be concentrated in one man's hands this great line of historians came to an end. Truth, too, suffered."⁹⁴ For Tacitus, autocracy is the death of history. The Neostoic dramatists of the Essex and post-Essex factions fought for more than the legacy of their former patron: they became, albeit briefly, warriors in the battle to save politic history from the controlling hand of absolutism. *Byron's* brutally dismembered text stands as an enduring memorial to Essex's history players and their battles with the censor.

⁹⁴ Tacitus, *The Histories*, tr. Rhiannon Ash (London: Penguin, 2009), 3. Antony's defeat by Augustus (then Octavius) at the Battle of Actium in 31 BC marks the dramatic catastrophe of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* (c.1607).

Chapter One

“A Lively Patterne of Things to Come”:¹ John Hayward’s Dramatic Historiography

Introduction

In February 1599, young civil lawyer John Hayward rushed into print *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII*, apparently to coincide with the Earl of Essex’s imminent departure for Ireland and his much-anticipated confrontation with the rebellious Earl of Tyrone. A short work focusing on the events leading up to the deposition of *Richard II* and Henry’s consolidation of power during his inaugural year, *Henrie IIII* is celebrated as the first English history to employ the ‘politic’ style of Cornelius Tacitus, whose gripping dramatic narratives exploring historical events through human causation were supported and exploited by both continental republicans and sympathizers of Machiavelli’s *realpolitik*.² Posterity, however, remembers *Henrie IIII* for its Latin dedication seemingly encouraging Essex’s political ambitions as another Bolingbroke. Over the summer, as the Irish campaign faltered and Hayward’s book soared in popularity, the Privy Council became suspicious. Already exasperated by the

¹ A note on quotation and citation: where available, I follow original spelling, save for distinguishing *v* from *u* and *j* from *i*, following common practice. Unless stated otherwise, all Shakespeare references are from the current Arden edition. *Henrie IIII* refers to the first part of Hayward’s history; *The Second Part* signifies the sequel. Parenthetical in-text citations employ page numbers for *Henrie IIII* and folio symbols for the *Second Part*, which was never formally paginated. I have slightly modified in-text citation of Daniel to avoid confusion between his poetry and the plays. *The Civil Wars* cites book, stanza, and line (e.g., 2:4.1-3), whereas plays follow the usual format (2.4.1-3).

² Giuseppe Toffanin compares the republican “red Tacitists” to Machiavelli’s “black Tacitists”; see Peter Burke, “Tacitism,” in *Tacitus*, ed. T.A. Dorey (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), 162-63.

manner in which history in all its generic forms was being decoded for its contemporary applications, the government enacted the Bishop's Order of 1 June 1599 banning satires, epigrams, and unlicensed histories and plays. A second run of 1500 copies of *Henrie IIII* was swept up by the edict and burned before it reached the booksellers' stalls. Its "Epistle Apologeticall" indicating some kind of prior censorial intrusion survived in scribal form to be used at Hayward's trial.³

Essex's unauthorized return from Ireland on 28 September instigated the final act of his own *de casibus* tragedy, that of a fallen favorite whose desperate acts would lead inexorably to the executioner's block fifteen months later. Hayward now found himself cast in the role of a conspirator and Elizabeth charged Francis Bacon to scrutinize *Henrie IIII* for sedition. Hayward's book was cited heavily at a private hearing into Essex's conduct on 5 June 1600, and on 11 July Hayward was summoned before the Privy Council to assist their enquiries. Two days later, he was remanded to the Tower without formal charge. On 22 January 1601, with the Essex faction heading toward catastrophe, Hayward was re-examined for the offence of having "selected a storie 200 yeres old, and [having] published it last year, intendynge the application of it to this tyme,"⁴ Chained to his analogy, Hayward was detained at her majesty's pleasure, gaining his release and a

³ There are in fact two copies of this epistle, recorded in PRO SP 12/275, 59 and 60.

⁴ So concluded Attorney General Coke at Hayward's hearing of 11 July 1600; PRO SP 12/275, 20.

full pardon only upon James I's accession almost three years later. No other writer during the period suffered such a long confinement as a result of his literary work.⁵

Commentators, then and now, deem the author and his debut work to be a victim of poor timing, careless judgment, or bad luck. Under investigation, the terrified Deputy Licensor, Samuel Harsnett, portrayed the dedication as a printer's afterthought that intended to exploit Essex's reputation to advertise the book's military and Irish matters.⁶ In the immediate aftermath of the 1601 rebellion, William Camden described *Henrie IIII* as "an unfortunate thing to the author, who was punished by long imprisonment for his untimely setting forth thereof."⁷ For the next two centuries Hayward's historical work was itself consigned to the history books. In 1927, Evelyn May Albright's bold but improbable attempt to involve Hayward and Shakespeare in a broader Essex conspiracy retrieved the historian from the footnotes of literary scholarship,⁸ but retained the image of an author pitied as "more unfortunate than he deserved to be."⁹ New historicists, convinced that the re-staging of Shakespeare's *Richard II* on the eve of the Essex rebellion in February 1601 was an attempt to use the theater to subvert authority,

⁵ For a full account of the publishing history, see *The First and Second Parts of John Hayward's 'The Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII'*, ed. John J. Manning (London: Royal Historical Society, 1991), 18-52.

⁶ Richard Dutton, "Buggeswords: Samuel Harsnett and the Licensing, Suppression and Afterlife of Dr. John Hayward's *The first part of the life and reign of King Henry IV*," *Criticism*, 35.3 (1993), 303-8.

⁷ Camden, *Annals*, (1625), 4:192-3.

⁸ Albright's unconvincing argument that *Richard II* (1595) was based on an unfinished manuscript of *Henrie IIII* (1599) instigated an acrimonious debate with Ray Heffner in the pages of the *PMLA*. See Albright, 30.4 (Sept., 1915), 451-99; 42.3 (Sept., 1927), 686-720; 43.3 (Sept., 1928), 722-56; Heffner, 45.3 (Sept., 1930), 754-80; Albright, 46.3 (Sept., 1931), 722-56; Heffner, 47.3 (Sept., 1932), 898-9; Albright, 45.3 (Sept. 1932), 899-901.

⁹ See Margaret Dowling, "Sir John Hayward's troubles over his *Life of Henry IV*," *The Library*, 4.11 (1930-31), 223.

nonetheless relegated Hayward's role to that of a decoy, while even recent moves to endorse "the printed book's inherent primacy as 'media' for the Richard II analogue" extricate Hayward from a political process beyond his control.¹⁰ As John Manning, Hayward's recent editor, concludes:

Hayward was approaching history in a novel way, and this yielded the sort of history where meaning was easily overtaken by events, even submerged by them. What Hayward could not anticipate was that the society to whom he offered the counsels of history would change its frame of reference significantly during the two years between his book's publication and the Essex revolt."¹¹

In this chapter, I shall challenge this critical orthodoxy that detaches England's first politic historian from the political imputations of his history by reading *Henrie III* as a calling card carefully crafted by an ambitious young lawyer seeking political advancement. Manning's assertion that Hayward's work was overtaken by historical events implies that Essex's failure in Ireland reflected upon the author's guilt in the eyes of the authorities, that Essex's declining fortunes somehow magnified Hayward's crime. This logic seems counterintuitive. Hayward's dedication would have been more sinister in the aftermath of an Essex triumph: only then would his book have been "overtaken by events," his "expectations[s] of future greatness" realized. I want to suggest that what truly exercised the authorities was the particular manner in which Hayward used history to speculate upon Essex's glorious future. While reading the future into the past had long

¹⁰ See, for example, Stephen Greenblatt's Introduction to *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance* (Norman, OK.: Pilgrim, 1982), and Jonathan Dollimore, "Shakespeare, cultural materialism and the new historicism," *Political Shakespeare* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984). For the political promotion of Hayward's literary history over Shakespeare's play, see Leeds Barroll, "A New History for Shakespeare and his Time," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 39 (1988), 452.

¹¹ Manning 42.

been a teleological function of the providential chroniclers, I shall argue that Hayward's synthesis of Tacitean political prophecy and analysis, animated by the self-determining energy of the English history play, offered a vision of and for Essex that was less determined but more determinable, an "expectation" of alternative futures, along with advice on how such contingencies might be controlled and exploited by an ambitious statesman.

In the following section, "Hayward and the Cult of Tacitus," I consider the implications of Hayward's adoption of Cornelius Tacitus (AD 56), the Roman historian lionized by Machiavelli and Guicciardini, whose trenchant critique of Neronian factionalism spoke especially to one Elizabethan faction. "In England," writes Alan T. Bradford, "the immediate fruit of the Tacitean revival was the emergence of a school of 'politic' historians who seem to have moved largely in the orbit of the Earl of Essex."¹² In the *Henrie VIII* Dedication and the Epistle to the Reader, I suggest, Hayward was in fact making an overt attempt to communicate with the Essex circle. I consider why Hayward might have attempted to implicate himself within such a dissident group -- the nature of the "scholarly service" he offered and the potential value to both parties of the "knowledge transaction."¹³ Building on Paul Hammer's depiction of a sophisticated

¹² Alan T. Bradford, "Stuart Absolutism and the 'Utility' of Tacitus," *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 46.2 (1983), 132.

¹³ For both terms see Lisa Jardine and William Sherman, "Pragmatic readers: knowledge transactions and scholarly services in late Elizabethan England," *Religion, culture and society in early modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994), 102-24.

Essex bureaucracy, I conceive Hayward's literary offering as a calculated bid to become a political advisor in Essex's employ.¹⁴

The next section, "Intertexts: Henrie the fourth, Henry IV, Henrie III,"¹⁵ considers the literary and rhetorical strategies Hayward employed in pressing his ambitions during a period in which the shaping and uses of history were undergoing radical, even revolutionary, change. While the extent and pace of this "historical revolution" is still hotly debated,¹⁶ J.G.A. Pocock is adamant about one of its defining schismatic features. "There was," he writes, "a great divorce between the scholars and antiquarians on the one hand, and the literary historians on the other."¹⁷ Hayward's politic history inhabited a narrow space between the scholars and the poets, briefly defying Sir Philip Sidney's famous distinctions and an increasing generic disparity that would soon expel poets from "history" altogether. "The English politic historians, Sir John Hayward, Sir Francis Bacon, and Samuel Daniel," notes F.J. Levy, "deliberately

¹⁴ During the 1990s, Hammer wrote a series of articles on the Essex circle, including "The Use of Scholarship: The Secretariat of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex, c. 1585-1601," *The English Historical Review*, 109.430 (1994); "Essex and Europe: Evidence from Confidential Instructions by the Earl of Essex, 1595-6," *The English Historical Review*, 111.441 (1996); and "Myth-Making: Politics, Propaganda and the Capture of Cadiz in 1596," *The Historical Journal* 40.3 (1997).

¹⁵ Daniel, Hayward, and Shakespeare all dealt with the Henry Bolingbroke deposition of Richard II, who is titled differently by each.

¹⁶ F. Smith Fussner coined the term "historical revolution" to describe the movement from a medieval providential model to an evidentiary historiography more suited to the scientifically-minded Age of Reason; see *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1590-1640* (New York: Columbia UP, 1962). Subsequent scholars have questioned the pace and chronology of this revolution: see especially F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1967). Others have perceived the movement as so slow and desultory as to disqualify its revolutionary status; see, for instance, Joseph H. Preston, "Was there an Historical Revolution?" *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38.2 (1977), 353-64.

¹⁷ J.G.A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987), 6.

made history writing more poetical, and they did it through ruthless selectivity, by the use of imagination in the writing of fictitious explanatory speeches, and by the construction of human causes for otherwise inexplicable human events.”¹⁸ While Levy describes such tropes as poetic “necessities,” these techniques strike me as prerequisites of another genre: the history play.

Pithy, popular, radically selective, its narratives driven by secondary causes -- by human rather than divine motivations -- the history play offered numerous formal solutions to a Tacitean historiography seeking platforms upon which to shape its political lessons. And yet the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century discomfort with Hayward’s tendency to make his history “a little too dramatical” still prevails today,¹⁹ for it is in his role as author -- especially as *dramatic* prose author -- that Hayward has received the least critical attention. By considering Hayward’s attempted ingress into the Essex circle in relation to Shakespeare and Samuel Daniel, both dramatic poets with an investment in history and a self-declared association with Essex, I explore the extent to which the formal demands of the theater shaped Hayward’s historiography.

The final section, “Playing with History,” considers the issue of authorial intention by asking why Hayward never acknowledged his debt to the dramatists. Hayward’s defense of deferring to scholarly chronicles and precedents hardly admits to vulgar theatrical influences -- a reaction that speaks both to the cultural derogation of drama (within academic if not judicial circles) and to the increasing authority of

¹⁸ Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* 244.

¹⁹ Bishop William Nicolson, *The English, Scotch and Irish historical libraries. Giving a short view and character of most of our historians, etc.*, 1736 (London, 1776), 216.

antiquarianism. Yet the records of the hearing of January 1601 reveal that Hayward was at his most equivocal when answering charges of time-tampering, of abusing chronology, and of inventing *post hoc* causation in a manner characteristic of the dramatist but inappropriate in the historian. I shall argue that Hayward, having played upon the anachronistic energies of the drama to animate his Henry-Essex parallel, felt compelled to distance himself from an analogy of which he had lost control, and whose future now threatened his own.

1. Hayward and the Cult of Tacitus

It seems inconceivable that Hayward composed his history unaware of its political associations. The analogy between Richard II and Elizabeth, first recorded as early as 1559 and famously confirmed by the Queen,²⁰ grew in toxicity as the succession crisis loomed.²¹ Rebecca Lemon's recent claim that "the contentious nature of Richard II stories has been overstated" supports her portrait of Hayward as a royalist lawyer rehearsing an academic debate on resistance theory, yet she remains a lone and not

²⁰ In late 1601 Elizabeth, while leafing through a collection of historical records, complained to her antiquary William Lambarde, "I am Richard II. Know ye not that?" Cited in F.J. Levy, "Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 50.1 (1987), 1.

²¹ Gomez Suarez de Fugueroa y Cordoba, 1st Duke of Feria, diplomat and close advisor to Phillip II, eroticized the analogy in a letter to the King dated April 17 1559, in which he suggested that Elizabeth, like Richard, was dependent on the whims of pretty boys, especially Robert Dudley, "who is so much in favour that he does whatever he likes with affairs, and it is even said that her majesty visits him in his chamber day and night," SP Spanish, 1558-67. For a full analysis of the analogy, see Marion A. Taylor, "*Bottom thou art translated*": political allegory in 'A Midsummer Night's Dream' (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1973): 17-30.

entirely convincing (or convinced) voice.²² Less certain, however, is the moment at which the Essex-Bolingbroke binary attached itself to the analogy to formulate a provocative quadratic equation. At Essex's treason trial of 19 February 1601, Sir Robert Cecil, the Queen's Attorney General, felt confident enough in the analogy's currency to declare that Essex "had been devising five or six years to be king of England," and that following the rebellion he "would have removed Her Majesty's servants, stepped into her chair, and perhaps treated her like Richard II."²³ But as early as 1597 Sir Walter Raleigh reported in a letter to Cecil that Essex "was wonderfull merry att your consait [conceit] of Richard the 2," adding ominously, "I hope it shall never alter."²⁴ It seems, then, that the analogy was fully established at least two years prior to the publication of *Henrie III*, had been encouraged by Essex himself, and was considered potentially seditious.

Nor is it likely, considering his training in ecclesiastical law, that Hayward was ignorant of the legal ramifications of publishing *Henrie III*.²⁵ While plays and entertainments fell under the jurisdiction of the Master of the Revels, the licensing of books had been the remit of the Archbishop of Canterbury since 1586. A civil lawyer would have been fully apprised of the 1581 "Acte against sedicious Words and Rumors uttered against the Queene," which judged "any manner of Booke Ryme Ballade Letter or

²² In "The Faulty Verdict in 'The Crown v. John Hayward,'" *Studies in English Literature* 41.1 (2001), Lemon buries her statement deep in a dense endnote (n. 13, 129), where it receives minimal exposure.

²³ PRO SP 12/278, 20.

²⁴ Quoted in Charles R. Forker's introduction to the political milieu of Shakespeare's *Richard II*, Arden 3 (London: Longman, 2002), 5.

²⁵ As early as 1595 Hayward was admitted to the Court of Arches, London's highest ecclesiastical court. Following Henry III's statute dismantling canon law, much of the "nominally secularized" ecclesiastical work was parceled out to the civilian lawyers; see Brian Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England, 1603-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 3-10; and Manning: 8-10.

Writing, conteyning any false sedicious and slaunderous Matter” a capital offence.²⁶

Hayward, whose history deals extensively with Richard’s impolitic Irish expedition, must also have been conscious of the recent proscription “on pain of death to write or speak of Irish affairs.”²⁷ The censor’s increasing disinclination to grant licenses to politic histories from the continent, underscored by the fact that John Wolfe, Hayward’s chosen printer, had previously published Machiavelli’s banned works *I Discorsi* and *Il Principe* under a false “Palermo” impression, suggest that Hayward’s choice of material and its dissemination indicate a conscious decision to engage with factional politics.²⁸

Those wishing to downplay Hayward’s interest in pursuing a political career must extricate him from the emerging “cult of Tacitus.”²⁹ When Cornelius Tacitus first took root among the Sidney circle at Oxford in the 1570s, his mordant aphorisms and cool analysis of state tyranny appealed to a minority, highly elite, market. He offered, according to Michel de Montaigne, “a seminary of moral, and a magazine of politic discourses for the provision and ornament of those that possess some place in the managing of the world.”³⁰ Once Essex had inherited the leadership of the Sidney circle, however, the problem for the late-Tudor/early-Stuart oligarchy was not Tacitus *per se* but

²⁶ *Statutes of the Realm* (London, 1819, rep. 1869), 4:659.

²⁷ So wrote George Fenner in apologizing to foreign friends for being guarded in reporting Essex’s return from Ireland; quoted in *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of Elizabeth, 1595-97*, ed. Mary Ann Everett Green, (London: Longman, 1869), xv.

²⁸ For discussions of the political character of John Wolfe, see W.W. Greg, “Samuel Harsnett and Hayward’s *Henry IV*,” *The Library* 5.9 (1956), 1-10; and Clare 26.

²⁹ In “Stoicism and Roman Example: Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50 (Spring 1989), 210, J.H.M Salmon employs this loaded phrase to characterize the increasingly radicalized employment of Tacitus.

³⁰ Michel de Montaigne, “The Art of Conferring” in *Essays*, tr. John Florio 1603 (London: Putnam, 1904), 5:265.

the Essex Taciteans, who vociferously articulated the parallels between the politics of flattery and favoritism at Elizabeth's court and the imperial tyrannies of first-century Rome. They complained of "the moths and mice of court" and even likened the death of Prince Henry in 1613 to the poisoning of Germanicus.³¹ However improbable or unjust these comparisons must have seemed, over time what began as a "literary convention took on the specious guise of moral truth."³²

By the time Hayward came to write England's first politic history enthusiasm for Tacitus among the ruling elite was already being undermined by anxiety over his ubiquity and his potential applications. The "arch Flamen of Modern Policy" threatened to expose the secret operations of statehood, while teaching tyranny to princes and disloyalty to their subjects.³³ Tacitus's histories (or Savile and Greneway's translations of them) were read "like almanacks," according to Ben Jonson: "For twelve yeares yet to come, what each state lacks, / They carry in their pockets Tacitus."³⁴ And Hayward was clearly one such reader, borrowing heavily from Savile's translations, especially his historical reconstruction of *The Ende of Nero and the Beginning of Galba*, the missing books connecting Tacitus's *Histories* to the *Life of Agricola*.³⁵ Savile's Machiavellian reading of

³¹ For the moth analogy, see Sir Charles Cornwallis, *A discourse of the most illustrious prince, Henry, late Prince of Wales*, 1626 (London, 1641), 217. Salmon quotes Sir Symonds d'Ewes sinister parallel, 209.

³² Salmon 217.

³³ Trojano Boccalini, *Advertisements from Parnassus* (1612-13), trans. Henry Cary, Earl of Monmouth (London, 1674), 115.

³⁴ "The New Crie," *The Poems of Ben Jonson*, ed. Bernard H. Newdigate (Oxford: Blackwell, 1936), 40.

³⁵ Edwin Benjamin records six parallel passages between Savile and Hayward, three battle scenes, and two groups of epigrammatic characters. While most borrowings are applied conventionally as aphorisms or maxims, Benjamin notes the preponderance of politically sensitive parallels that Hayward drew between the Roman occupation of

Nero's downfall due to political incompetence rather than hubris offers a formative model for Richard II in *Henrie IIII*.

Countering the prevailing notion that Hayward was naively trapped by his dedication, his acutely self-aware paratexts encrypt concerted attempts to enter into the conversations of a clique. When called upon to defend himself before the hearing of July 1600, the inexperienced licenser Samuel Harsnett claimed that the Hayward manuscript he approved “was heddless wthout epistle, preface or dedication at all w^{ch} moved me to thinke it was a meer rhetorical exornation [embellishment] of a part of our English historie to shewe the foyle of the Author his witt.”³⁶ It is hardly surprising that Harnsett worked so hard to detach the body of the text from the “head,” for in reader-response terms everything about this paratextual material seems designed to encourage a “strong” reading. The inflammatory dedication prophesying an Essex “*magnus siquidem es, & presenti iudicio, & futuri temporis expectatione*” (“great indeed, both in present judgment and in expectation of future time”) is couched in an oblique Latin whose “twists and turns” Arthur J. Kinney considers “deliberately obscure.”³⁷ Such opacity also encourages subtle variations in the dedication's request for protection in terms that activate the Henry-Essex binary and both Earls' popular reputations: “(illustrissime comes) cuius nomen si Henrici nostri fronte radiaret, ipse & laetior & tutiorin vulgus prodiret.”

savage Britain and the English enterprise in Ireland; see "Sir John Hayward and Tacitus," *The Review of English Studies*, 8.31 (1957), 275-6.

³⁶ PRO SP 12/275, 41.

³⁷ I quote Manning's most recent translation here (61). Two further translations offer slight alternatives. Arthur F Kinney, "Essex and Shakespeare versus Hayward," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44.4 (1993), 465, retains the awkward syntax: "For you are indeed a great man, both in the estimation of the present day and also in what we look to from the future." For the earliest printed translation, see W.W. Greg, "Samuel Harsnett and Hayward's *Henry IV*," *The Library*, 5.9 (1956), 10.

Manning's straightforward translation -- "illustrious earl, whose name should it shine on our Henry's forehead, he would more happily and more safely go forth among the people" -- is rendered more intimate by Kinney's added endearment: "were your name and fame radiant on the brow of our *beloved* Henry" [my italics]. W.W. Greg, meanwhile, makes the possessive pronoun confidential: "whose name if it should shine in the front of *my* Henry" [my italics]. Even the imperfect subjunctive "radiaret" questions whether the hope is past or to come. It is striking that such persistent linguistic ambivalence comes from the pen of a Doctor of Civil Law whose training in international jurisprudence required him to be fluent (and lucid) in classical Latin.³⁸

The dedication becomes even more suspect when read in conjunction with an epistle, "A.P. to the Reader," which adumbrates the didactic purpose of politic history as that which "sets foorth unto us, not onely precepts, but lively patterns, both for private directions and for affayres of state, whereby in short time young men may be instructed, and ould men more fullie furnished with experience."³⁹ Of itself the Latin dedication follows a common protocol; combined with the English instructions on how to "read" the history, however, it constructs a bilingual paratext that is unique among the sixty-six extant works dedicated to Essex.⁴⁰ Eight of the nine Latin dedications within this group are accompanied by corresponding Latin epistles, while the only dedication with a bilingual component, Roger Rawlyns's *Cassius of Parma, his Orpheus* (1587), inverts the model and the meaning. The Latin encomium extols the Earl's intelligence, while the

³⁸ Levack, *Civil Lawyers* 26.

³⁹ Hayward, "A.P. to the Reader," A3-A4^v.

⁴⁰ Leonard Bird offers a taxonomy of works dedicated to Essex in "The Earl of Essex, Patron of Letters" (Ph.D. diss. U of Utah, 1969), which remains the only (unpublished) study of Essex's place in the patronage system.

preceding English dedication -- there is no epistle to the reader -- purposes to “suppresse to the use only of my private friends, that which otherwise I should be contented should be common.”⁴¹ Rawlyn’s dedication, in other words, defines the subsequent exclusionary zone and, in plain English, alerts non-Latin readers to proceed no further. Hayward’s paratext, by contrast, expands from the exclusive Latin dedication to an inclusive set of instructions in English that promises to decipher the practice of government for a broad readership. It is little wonder that Lord Chief Justice Popham asked Hayward exactly why he wished to educate “young men more shortly and old men more fully [in] matters of state?”⁴²

If the interrogators could prove complicity between Hayward and Essex in the formation of this seditious material then, as Richard Dutton argues, “criminal conspiracy” might be usefully added to the many charges that Essex faced following the rebellion.⁴³ Accordingly, where the bilingual paratext speaks to a dual readership, the anonymous epistle raises the possibility of co-authorship, prompting Popham to ask: “Who made the preface to the reader?” The question was not unreasonable. At the second hearing of January 1601, Hayward admitted to “entitling the [preface] under the letters A.P., as other writers have done.”⁴⁴ Yet the writer most likely to have formulated such an address was Essex or one of his secretaries,⁴⁵ for the preface blatantly imitates the earlier “A.B. to

⁴¹ Roger Rawlyns, *Cassius of Parma, his Orpheus* (London, 1587), A2.

⁴² “Interrogatories to be administered to Dr. Hayward,” PRO SP 12/274, 100.

⁴³ Dutton 313.

⁴⁴ PRO SP 12/278, 20.

⁴⁵ In the propaganda war with Raleigh following Cadiz in 1596, Essex’s secretary Sir Henry Cuffe composed under his master’s guidance the “anonymous” *True Relacion* (subsequently banned but widely circulated in manuscript). In a letter that accompanied the pamphlet to London, Essex commanded Secretary Reynolds to “Ask whether Mr

the Reader” that accompanied Savile’s *The Ende of Nero* (1591), which is widely accepted as having been written by Essex himself.⁴⁶ Furthermore, a note in Popham’s “Interrogatories” picks up on a phrasal echo that connects these two prefaces to other early writings on Tacitus: “he conceives that book might be not only precepts but patterns for private direction.” Essex’s 1591 epistle describes Tacitean history both as “the treasure of times past, and as well a guide as image of man's presente state, a *true and lively pattern of things to come*” [my italics]. Completing the translation begun by Savile, fellow Essexian Richard Greneway prefaced his 1598 *The description of Germanie* with the statement that Tacitus is not only a “guide [...] to man’s present state,” but a “true and *lively patterne of things to come*” [my italics].⁴⁷ It seems reasonable to suppose that Hayward employed this cluster of Tacitean “buggeswords” both to make contact with the Essex literary circle and to alert the reader to the political implications of his history.⁴⁸

If *Henrie IIII*’s speculative paratexts promote Hayward’s image as an active agent in his own history, to some scholars his choice of patron also betrays his political naiveté. “To be associated with Essex might occasionally do one good,” Levy argues, “but more

Grivill will lend his initials to the inscription. [...] If he be unwilling, you may put RB, which some no doubt will interpret to be Mr Beale.” Essex had fallen out with Robert Beale, a clerk on the Privy Council, the previous year; see Hammer, “Capture of Cadiz,” 630-32.

⁴⁶ In 1619 Ben Jonson alleged that, “Essex wrote that Epistle or preface before the translation of the last part of Tacitus, which is A. B”; see *Conversations of William Drummond with Ben Jonson at Hawthornden*, ed. Philip Sidney (London: Gay and Bird, 1900), 259. Bradford describes the authorship of the epistle as “an open secret (shared, for instance, by Ben Jonson, Edmund Bolton, and John Florio),” 132.

⁴⁷ *The Annales of Cornelius Tacitus: The Description of Germanie*, trans. Richard Greneway (London, 1598).

⁴⁸ John Chamberlain employed the term “buggesworde” when describing Hayward’s text to Dudley Carleton in September 1599; see Chamberlain, *Letters*, ed. N.E. McClure, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939), 1:70.

commonly the Earl's friends got little enough."⁴⁹ The fallout from the rebellion, however, almost certainly obscured the many benefits an Essexian connection offered. Moreover, as Jardine and Sherman have convincingly demonstrated, the "marginality -- and often invisibility -- of scholarly service relationships" intentionally cloaked the "highly specific (though not yet institutionally regularized) form of private service for politically involved public figures."⁵⁰ It is worth taking a moment to consider what Hayward hoped to gain from working for Essex.

While it is true that few of Essex's intimates rose under James because of the persistent antagonism of Cecil,⁵¹ authors like Hayward resided in the outer, and possibly safer, bounds of the circle. Robert Shephard breaks down the complex web of "clientage" that comprises early modern patronage into three subsets: friends (often allied by bonds of kinship) who offer direct advice and receive direct assistance; followers "bound by ties of subordination and favor"; and servants who hold "positions of trust."⁵² While politic authors resisted absolute identification with a single subset (for a time Shakespeare must have considered Southampton a friend as well as his patron), their function placed the writers within a social grouping that offered less freedom than friendship, but commensurately greater "influence, experience and hope for rewards."⁵³ And these rewards could be considerable. As reader of Cecil's foreign correspondence, Dutchman

⁴⁹ Levy, "Political History" 11.

⁵⁰ Jardine and Sherman, "Pragmatic Readers," 111 and 106.

⁵¹ See Margot Heinemann, "Rebel Lords, Popular Playwrights, and Political Culture: Notes on the Jacobean Patronage of the Earl of Southampton," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (Nov. 1991), 68-70.

⁵² Robert Shephard, "Court Factions in Early Modern England," *The Journal of Modern History* 64.4 (1992), 722-9.

⁵³ Shephard 728.

Levinus Munck accumulated houses in London and Surrey, land in Buckinghamshire, £12,000 in cash, and a good marriage, while the even greater wealth Richard Perceval accrued managing the lucrative Office of Wardships elevated his family to the Earldom of Egmont. Although Sir Henry Cuffe, Greek scholar and arch-Tacitean, paid the ultimate price for allegedly radicalizing Essex and was executed along with his master, generally these select positions were, in Alan Smith's words, "stepping stones on the road to wealth and official prominence."⁵⁴

Cecil's secretaries were essentially information-gatherers, translators, and "base penn clerks,"⁵⁵ whereas Essex's men were specialists granted autonomy and considerable authority. Sir Henry Wotton, who dealt with geopolitical issues in "Transilvania, Polonia, Italye and Germanye," did not care to have his portfolio intruded upon;⁵⁶ Cuffe was Essex's "publicity expert" as well as his resident Tacitean, and would frequently "discuss history's lessons with him";⁵⁷ Reynolds was the Earl's long-standing confidant who possessed the "Twofold virtue of ordering and keeping the tongue"⁵⁸; Anthony Bacon, a "special friend" with a nefarious talent for "gather[ing] other men's letters,"⁵⁹ was lured from France to be "foreign secretary," while his older brother Francis

⁵⁴ Alan G.R. Smith, "The Secretariats of the Cecils, circa 1580-1612," *The English Historical Review* 83.3 (1968), 502.

⁵⁵ Hammer quotes Cecil's disgruntled secretary Christopher Wilson in "Use of Scholarship" 30.

⁵⁶ Hammer, "Use of Scholarship" 34-35.

⁵⁷ Blair Worden, "Historians and Poets," *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 68, 1/2 (2005), 80.

⁵⁸ Hammer, "Uses of Scholarship" 36.

⁵⁹ The complaint against Bacon was made by Antonio Perez, disgraced councilor to Phillip II and subsequent intelligence retailer in Paris, where he made productive contact with Essex's overseas agent, Sir Robert Naunton; see Hammer, "Essex and Europe," 363.

dealt with domestic issues.⁶⁰ Although Essex's public image promoted aristocratic entitlement, the bureaucracy required to sustain his place on the Privy Council was strikingly egalitarian.⁶¹ Meritocratic employment offering the opportunity to grapple with the big issues of the day and to shape the career of a great politician --- to become, in effect, a political advisor -- must have strongly appealed to a civil lawyer of the middling classes like Hayward.⁶²

Over the past two decades Hammer has progressively replaced the popular image of Essex (both then and now) as a "foolhardy courtier and man of action" with a figure who "aspired to be a genuine international statesman."⁶³ And it was in the European theater that Hayward perhaps saw the opportunity that would kick-start a history project he claimed had been gestating for twelve years.⁶⁴ Paradoxically, Cecilian efforts to avoid foreign wars were fuelled as much by xenophobia as by economics ("suffer not thy sons to pass the Alps," Burghley once quipped),⁶⁵ whereas Essex's interventionist military policy in defense of international Protestantism underpinned an anti-isolationist stance that extended even to the Catholic countries.

⁶⁰ F J. Levy, "Francis Bacon and the Style of Politics." *Renaissance Historicism: Selections from 'English Literary Review'* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), 153.

⁶¹ Aside from Sir Henry Wotton, Essex's secretariat gained social advancement through their academic achievements, and all bar Cuffe won seats in the House of Commons; see Hammer, "Employment of Scholars," 175.

⁶² Levack, "Civil Lawyers," notes that, unlike the two thousand or so common lawyers operating between 1603-41 that were drawn almost entirely from the landed gentry, the two hundred civil lawyers were largely middle-class and loyal to their employer rather than to ties of kinship or region, 1-5.

⁶³ Hammer, "Essex and Europe" 372.

⁶⁴ PRO SP 12/278, 20.

⁶⁵ Hammer, "Essex and Europe" 368.

To counteract the pacifists on the Privy Council and to shore up his own position during the 1590s, Essex employed two European servants, or “tourists.” In 1595, Dr. Henry Hawkyns was sent to Venice, where he “heard, read, disputed & conferred with the chief lawyears of our time (in French, German, and Italian).”⁶⁶ Around the same time Robert Naunton was dispatched to Paris to act as an intermediary with Antonio Perez (see *n.* 55), a political refugee he loathed as much for his homosexuality as for his Catholicism (neither of which seemed to trouble Essex), but whose information resulted in “a flood of superb reports on affairs at the French court which delighted both Essex and the Queen.”⁶⁷ The tourists’ roles as intelligence-gatherers and intermediaries required specific qualifications: they must be fluent in Latin, versed in international law (which was drawn largely from the Justinian code⁶⁸), and preferably well traveled. It is not surprising, therefore, that Essex chose two civil lawyers who had trained (like Hayward) at the Earl’s *alma mater*, Cambridge. For undisclosed reasons, both tourists terminated their employment with Essex in 1598, the same year Hayward wrote the first part of *Henrie IIII*. That Hayward would have been at least professionally acquainted with these lawyers encourages the hypothesis that, when these vacancies suddenly arose, the young lawyer responded expeditiously to an exciting career opportunity by offering Essex what he most prized -- advice on his glorious political future.

⁶⁶ Hammer, “Essex and Europe” 361.

⁶⁷ Hammer, “Essex and Europe,” 366.

⁶⁸ The *Corpus Juris Civilis*, compiled under Justinian in the sixth century and revived in the west five centuries later, embraced three legal traditions: the canon law of the Roman Catholic church, the commercial/maritime law of medieval Europe, and international law. For details, see Levack, “Law and Ideology: The Civil Law and Theories of Absolutism in Elizabethan and Jacobean England,” *The Historical Renaissance*, eds. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988), 221-22.

Henrie VIII contributes to a tradition of literary gambits. The allure of a Renaissance meritocracy in a centralized Tudor autocracy had generated various literary manifestations of self-advancement, from courtesy books to political treatises, from histories to manuals about the writing of history.⁶⁹ The “eviction of Rome and the advent of Italian humanist educational theory,” writes Frank Whigham, “placed the intellectual and social elite at the helm of power,” in their ambitious plans, if not always in practice.⁷⁰ Intrinsic to these works was the humanist notion of self-improvement through vicarious experience, articulated in epideictic prose (and sometimes verse) by newly empowered academics emerging from the universities. In his epistle “To the Reader” Hayward situates himself firmly within the humanist tradition of advice giving epitomized by Desiderius Erasmus’s canonical *The Education of a Christian Prince* (1516) and Sir Thomas Elyot’s *Book of the Governor* (1531). “For examples are of greater force to stir unto vertue then bare precepts,” Hayward writes, “in so much as Cicero said that nothing could be taught so well without example” (A4’).

The problem for Hayward, and the key concern for the authorities, lay in defining exactly what kind of virtues might be stirred from reflecting upon rebellion. For two hundred years English historians had struggled with the Plantagenet paradox of the bad king and the good rebel. From the medieval chronicles through to the satirical *Mirror for Magistrates* Richard II had been characterized as a legitimate yet incompetent monarch

⁶⁹ Jean Bodin’s *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History* (1566) is perhaps the most famous of these manuals.

⁷⁰ Frank Whigham, *Ambition and Privilege: The Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1984), 12.

who “ruled by lust [...] and alwayes put flatterers most in trust,”⁷¹ while Henry’s sinful yet successful deposition paved the way for England’s greatest hero, Henry V.⁷² The Tudor chroniclers, especially Polydore Vergil and Edward Hall, obviated this moral conundrum by constructing a complex providential scheme in which Henry’s crime instigated a civil war that could be terminated only by the cleansing sword of Henry Tudor, later Henry VII, on the field of Bosworth in 1485. According to this Tudor myth, Henry IV’s sin is part of God’s strategy. Not surprisingly, by the time we reach Holinshed Henry is both pitied and condemned, by turns victim of Richard’s “furious outrage” and guilty of “ambitious [...] tigerlike crueltie” (3.508/2/10).⁷³

The politic historian, however, was less concerned with moral judgments than with political efficacy, and the “virtue” Hayward hoped to stimulate implies a practical ethics Machiavelli termed *virtù* rather than a personal ethics founded on, and subject to, Christian morality. As Levy writes, “The new [or politic] historians assumed that monarchs knew enough to make their own decisions regarding the morality of an action, but also that the same monarchs might be grateful for advice concerning its expediency.”⁷⁴ Hayward’s lack of moral judgment on Henry might be appropriate to his historiography, but to the authorities it sounded suspiciously like collusion. To Lord

⁷¹ *A myrroure for magistrates. Wherein may be seen by example of other, with howe grevous plagues vices are punished: and howe frayle and unstable worldly prosperitie is founde, even of those, whom fortune seemeth most highly to fauour* (London, 1559), fo. xvii.

⁷² Forker (24) points out that sympathies for Richard among Yorkists and French chroniclers sensitive to the birthright of the King and his young bride, Isabelle de Valois, were not represented in English histories.

⁷³ Raphael Holinshed, *The Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 3 vols (London, 1587).

⁷⁴ Levy, *Tudor History* 237.

Chief Justice Popham, Hayward was guilty precisely because he had “omit[ed] every principal point that made against the traitor or rebels”; his historiography was effectively condemned for lack of moral bias.

Hayward’s dedication, by attaching the amoral portrait of Henry to the aspirational figure of Essex, inevitably opened Hayward to charges of factional incitement, a suspicion only compounded by the author’s dogged refusal to recognize the Essex parallel and his insistence that he “intended no particular application to present history.”⁷⁵ His assertion stretches credibility when we consider the divergence between the Henry of the chronicles and Hayward’s portrait. Holinshed, for instance, describes a diminutive, over-zealous, increasingly unpopular monarch:

He was of a meane stature, well proportioned, and formally compact, quicke and deliuer, [...] but yet to speake a troth by his proceedings, after hee had attained to the Crowne, what with such taxes, tallages, subsidies, and exactions as hee was constreyned to charge the people with, and what by punishing suche as moued with disdeyne to see him vsurpe the Crowne (contrarie to the othe taken at hys entring into this lande, vppon his returne from exile) did at sundry times rebell against him, hee wanne himselfe more hatred than in all hys lyfe time.

(Holinshed 3/540/2/60)

Henrie IIII’s introduction of the young Henry Bolingbroke, which exemplifies

Hayward’s Tacitean praxis, is worth quoting at length here, both for its striking variances

to Holinshed and its similarities to Essex. Every bit the Renaissance man, Henry is

of good strength and agilitie of body, skilfull in armes, and of ready dispatch, jointly shewing himself both earnest and advised in all his actions. Hee was quicke and present in conceite, forward in attempt, couragious in execution, and most times fortunate in events. There was no great place of employment and charge which hee would not rather affect for glorie, then refuse either for peril or for paines. And in service hee often prooved himselfe not only a skilfull commaunder by giving directions, but also a good souldier in using his weapon,

⁷⁵ SPD, 12/278, 20.

adventuring further in person, sometimes, then policie would permit. His expences were liberall and honourable, yet not exceeding the measure of his receiptes. He was verie courteous and familiar respectively towards all men, whereby hee procured great reputation and regarde, especially with those of the meaner sort; for high humilities take such deepe roote in the mindes of the multitude, that they are more strongly drawne by unprofitable curtesies then by churlish benefits. [...] Neither did the continuance of his raigne bring him to a proude port and stately esteeming of himselfe, but in his latter yeare he remained so gentle & faire in carriage that therby chiefly hee did weare out the hatred that was borne in him for the death of King Richard. [...] He could not lightly be drawne into any cause, & was stiffe & constant in a good cause].

(*Life and Raigne of Henrie IIII* 69)

Hayward's Henrician portrait exhibits the key elements of the politic style; epigrammatic and condensed, balanced and reasoned, sententious yet laconic, the commentator laces praise with subtle critique that crosses Plantagenet-Tudor timelines. The searching light that shines on Henry's forehead reflects also on Essex. Like Henry, Essex possessed a full armory of martial skills, though his courage was sometimes imprudent: his challenge to single combat at the gates of Lisbon made him a darling of the balladeers, though subject to a furious reprimand from Elizabeth for "his strange behaviours."⁷⁶ Hayward's assertion, that "to some men [Henry] seemed too greedie for glorie, making small difference of the meanes by which he attained it" (69), anticipates Robert Naunton's later memoir paralleling Essex and the third Duke of Buckingham, in which he recollects his old patron's "over desire and thirstiness after fame."⁷⁷ That the young Hereford's military successes in France were "entertained with greate straungnesse" (75) by Richard also recalls Bacon's anxiety that Essex's overseas military

⁷⁶ *Elegy on the Earl of Essex*, anon. in *Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative*, ed. Robert Harding Evans, 3 vols. (London: Bulmer and Company, 1810): 3.78. Elizabeth's letter, dated April 15 1589, is quoted in G.B. Harrison, *The Life and Death of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex* (London: Cassell, 1937), 43.

⁷⁷ Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia*, c.1630, ed. Edward Arber (London: English Reprints, 1870), 77.

adventures risked unifying an envious court opposition and upsetting the Queen: “I demand whether there can be a more dangerous image than this represented to any monarch living.”⁷⁸ The similarities between Henry and Essex are therefore both celebratory and cautionary.

The parallel becomes even more striking in the reflection’s disparities and deviations. Henry’s reputation as a “skilled commander” was not always recognized in Essex, who wrote *A true relation of the action at Cadiz* (1598) to justify his expedition’s failure to destroy the Spanish fleet or capture its gold. Hayward’s Henry is assiduously courteous, as when, on a mission to Genoa, he “incites his men, the good by prayse, the bad by example rather then reprove, as more ready to commend the vertues of the one then to upbraide the vices of the other” (89). When criticized or slighted, Essex frequently voiced his petulance, and Camden recalls the Earl’s haughty tendency to “disparage and to dispraise all that were not at his Devotion” (a spiritual term loaded with factional implication). Above all, Henry favors diplomacy over belligerence, commanding his victorious forces that none of the Duke of Ireland’s soldiers “should be harmed but those that did make resistance or beare armour” (84). Reacting to Cecil’s peace negotiations with Spain in 1598, Essex wrote to Anthony Bacon expressing his antithetical position: “I prefer war before peace [...] and so consequently all my actions, counsel, and endeavours do tend to keep up the state of England in continual wars.”⁷⁹ Henry and Essex are similar enough to encourage the analogue, yet divergent enough to

⁷⁸ Bacon’s letter to Essex is quoted in Edwin A. Abbot, *Francis Bacon: An Account of his Life and Works* (London: Macmillan, 1885), 55.

⁷⁹ *The Earl of Essex's Vindication of the War with Spain in an Apology to Mr. Anthony Bacon. Penn'd by Himself, Anno 1598* (London, 1603).

be instructive, and “it is in these differences,” Alzada Tipton believes, “that Hayward does the real work of history.”⁸⁰

In a series of letters preparing the young Roger Manners, fifth Earl of Rutland, for his European tour, Essex articulates his willingness to receive counsel from all quarters: “I hold it for a principle in the course of intelligence of state, not to discourage men of mean sufficiency from writing unto me.”⁸¹ Essex’s willingness to make himself available to blunt, often critical, advice placed him in that small vanguard of humanist commanders and princes who, like Erasmus’s exemplary King Ptolemy, sought out “books on how to rule the kingdom, and to turn to them for council and advice, because in books are to be read the things that friends never dare to say.”⁸² Unlike Shakespeare or Daniel, however, Hayward had no known affiliations with the Essex circle and we cannot assume that he had access to Essex’s semi-private correspondence. Moreover, it is one thing to offer personal advice in private, as Cuffe was wont to do,⁸³ quite another to make public such a critique, a point repeatedly made by Hayward’s interrogators: “Might he think that this history would not be very dangerous to come amongst the common people?”⁸⁴ In the following section I will explore the notion that Hayward was encouraged, consciously or otherwise, to publicize his contentious material not only through the experience of lawyers and clients with whom he worked, but also through the literary circle developing

⁸⁰ Alzada Tipton, “‘Lively Patterns ... For Affayres of State’: Sir John Hayward’s *the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII* and the Earl of Essex,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 33.3 (2002), 780.

⁸¹ The three letters to Rutland, written in 1596, were probably co-authored by Essex and Bacon; see, Hammer, *Polarization*, 150.

⁸² *Desiderius Erasmus: The Education of the Christian Prince with the Panegyric for Archduke Philip of Austria*, ed. Lisa Jardine (Cambridge: CUP, 1969), 130.

⁸³ Worden 80.

⁸⁴ Lord Chief Justice Popham, PRO SP 12/274, 100.

around Essex, to whom he went for historical reference (Shakespeare's second tetralogy and Daniel's *Civil Wars* deal with the same period), and also for models on how to constructively critique the Essex persona. I want, that is, to present the portrait of Hayward as a factional writer.

2. Intertexts: *Henrie the fourth*, Henry IV, *Henrie IIII*

Hayward's refusal to acknowledge either his Essexian parallel or his Tacitean strategy made him vulnerable to charges of high treason. At Essex's trial Coke proclaimed:

It is to be remembered there was a book of Henry IV with many things to make those times seem like these and himself like Henry IV. [...] He would have removed her Majesty's servants, perhaps let her continue a time, and then stepped into her chair and put her where Richard II was.⁸⁵

However politically motivated his comments, Coke viewed *Henrie IIII* through the customary humanist lens of didactic exemplarity. Yet the assiduous manner with which Coke scoured Hayward's text for its "outward pretences (and secret drifts)" reflects his own sense that history constituted more than a simple reflection. In fact, everyone involved in the Hayward case was conscious of a shifting subtext in *Henrie IIII*, of voices beneath the surface. Elizabeth, believing *Henrie IIII* the "work of some more mischievous author," threatened to have Hayward "racked to produce his author." Bacon informed the Queen that "for treason I found none, but for felony very many, [...] for he had taken most of the sentences of Cornelius Tacitus."⁸⁶ And Lord Chief Justice Popham

⁸⁵ PRO SP 12/278, 54.

⁸⁶ Both accounts are reported by Bacon in his *Apology* (1604), quoted in Spedding 10:150.

asked repeatedly, “Who made the preface to the reader? [...] Who were his animators to set it forth?”⁸⁷

Identifying writer(s) and reader(s) is as perilous a critical business in a post-
poststructuralist world as is denying either in an Early Modern one, where the “death of
the author” had potentially more immediate consequences than Roland Barthes intended.
Intertextuality, as defined by Jonathan Culler, further distances the text from the author:
“[W]e are faced with an infinite intertextuality where conventions cannot be traced to
their source and thus positivistically identified. [Texts] depend on prior existence of
codes and conventions, and it is the nature of codes and conventions to have lost their
origins.”⁸⁸ Conversely, as Gunilla Florby argues in her study of “Echoing Texts” in
Chapman’s *Byron* plays, “[i]n the Renaissance the literary predecessors were there to be
used, appropriated from, elaborated on, if possible refined on”.⁸⁹ such reclamation, after
all, is what defines the Renaissance. Yet there is something liberating in freeing up the
linear demands of positivistic textual debts, especially in a period when much of the
historical material was drawn from a fund of common knowledge, when compositional
dating was tenuous, and when the boundaries between genres were so porous that
dramatic invention might be found in the pages of history books and history staged as
tragedy.⁹⁰ We need therefore to consider not only the textual echoes that suggest authors

⁸⁷ PRO SP 12/274, 100.

⁸⁸ Jonathan Culler, "Presupposition and Intertextuality," *MLN* 91.6 (1976), 1383.

⁸⁹ Gunilla Florby, *Echoing Texts: George Chapman's Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron* (Gothenburg: Lund UP, 2004), 15.

⁹⁰ We need only think of the confusions faced by the compilers of Shakespeare’s First Folio of 1623, who placed *The Tragedy of Richard III* under “Histories,” the history of *Julius Caesar* under “Tragedies,” and the ambiguous *Troilus and Cressida* almost nowhere at all. The editors belatedly inserted the play as a tragedy (too late to be listed in

were reading one another, but also the experiential intertextuality that comes from theatrical spectatorship.

A valuable body of mid-twentieth century scholarship links Samuel Daniel's *First Fowre Bookes of the Civile Warres* of 1595 to Shakespeare's *Richard II* (1595) and *Henry IV* plays (1597-98).⁹¹ Following a protracted debate over the overlapping chronology of *Richard II* and *The Civil Wars* critics now accept that Shakespeare was reading Daniel in the mid-1590s, while Daniel turned to Shakespeare for subsequent revisions of his epic. Where literary scholars satisfy themselves with locating textual echoes,⁹² historicists also perceive historiographic and ideological correspondences that suggest factional affiliations.⁹³ I want to enrich this intertextuality by exploring areas of especially Essexian concern where Hayward's indebtedness to Shakespeare reflects and builds upon Shakespeare's obligations to Daniel. Connecting the three points of influence reveals a more complex three-dimensional structure of interconnectedness; put another way, in squaring the triangle we begin to define the presence of a literary circle.

the Catalogue), despite the fact that the in the 1609 quarto it describes itself as a history on the title page and as a comedy in the "Epistle to the Reader."

⁹¹ For details see the following chapter, "Daniel the Silent Poet," 190-92.

⁹² See, for example, R.M. Smith, *Froissart and the English Chronicle Play* (New York: Columbia UP, 1915), 143-57; Gillian Wright, "Samuel Daniel's Use of Sources in *the Civil Wars*," *Studies in Philology* 101.1 (2004): 59-87; Joan Rees, "Shakespeare's Use of Daniel," *Modern Language Review* 55.1 (1960), 79-82; and George M. Logan, "Lucan-Daniel-Shakespeare: New Light on the Relation between *the Civil Wars* and *Richard II*," *Shakespeare Studies* 9 (1976): 121-41.

⁹³ See, for instance, Laurence Michel and Cecil C. Seronsy, "Shakespeare's History Plays and Daniel: An Assessment," *University of North Carolina Press* 52.4 (1955): 549-77.

F.J. Levy asserts that in the portrayals of Henry in *Henrie IIIII* and Hotspur in *The Second Part* Hayward had “been to school to Shakespeare,”⁹⁴ yet in key areas Shakespeare had first taken a lesson from Daniel. Concerning, for example, the issue of Henry’s exploitation of his support among the people, a common criticism leveled at Essex, most chroniclers, including Holinshed, record the popular acclaim with which Henry’s deposition of Richard was received: “For in everie towne and village where he passed, children rojoyed, women clapped their hands, and men cried out for joy.”⁹⁵ Daniel, activating the Essex parallel by raising what Naunton called “that deceitful fame of popularity,”⁹⁶ hinted at Henry’s exploitation of popularity for political capital -- his populism. In the *Civil Wars*, Richard’s Queen Isabel, wrongly identifying her husband returning to London from Ireland, inadvertently describes Henry’s behavior:

Do you not see him? yonder that is hee,
Mounted on that white courser all in white,
There where the thronging troupes of people bee;
I know him by his seate, he sits s'upright:
Lo, now he bowes : deare Lord, with what sweet grace
How long haue I long'd to behold that face!
(*Civil Wars* 2:70.4-8)

Influenced by Daniel’s characterization of the “young afflicted queen” (2:66.1) -- historically an eleven-year-old -- Shakespeare portrays Isabel as a similarly loving wife in 5.1 of *Richard II*.

⁹⁴ Levy, “Beginnings of Politic History,” 20. Manning, however, considers their treatments as “analogous” rather than interactive, 42.

⁹⁵ Holinshed 3.501/2/44.

⁹⁶ Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia* 77.

Shakespeare also develops the theme of Henry's "courtship of the common people," at least in the eyes of Richard, who recollects (although he was not present) his cousin's paradoxically triumphant banishment the year before:

How he did seem to dive into their hearts
With humble and familiar courtesy;
What reverence he did throw away on slaves,
Wooing poor craftsman with the craft of smiles
[...]
Off goes his bonnet to an oyster-wench
(R2 1.4.25-31)

Hewing closely to Daniel's phrasing, Shakespeare's York later recalls the returning Henry greeting the London crowds, "from the one side to the other turning, / Bare-headed, lower than his proud steed's neck" (5.2.18-19). Everard Guilpin's verse satire *Skialetheia, Or a Shadow of Truth* (1598), borrows directly from these Shakespearean passages to mock Essex, or "signor Machiavel's," populism: "Great Foelix [Essex] passing through the street / Vayleth his cap to each one he doth meet."⁹⁷ Guilpin's verse satire bespeaks the availability, at least to the political literati, of Shakespeare's Essex-Henry analogy. A year later Hayward composed the now familiar portrait of Henry, the "last noble of the popular faction" (104):

Again, the duke for his part was not negligent to uncover the head, to bowe the body, to stretch forth the hand to every meane person, and to use all other complements of popular behaviour wherewith the mindes of the common multitude are much delighted and drawne, taking that to bee courtesie which the severer sort accompt abasement (120).

⁹⁷ Everard Guilpin, Satire 1 in *Skialetheia, or a Shadow of Truth, in Certaine Epigrams and Satyres*, ed. D Allen Carroll (Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1991), 59-61.

As textual echoes fed into the popular imagination to create tropes that would return to the page and the stage, so the “vayling” of a hat became a byword, it seems, for Essex’s common touch.

To varying degrees Daniel, Shakespeare, and Hayward all share a Baconian concern that, whereas Richard had leased his country to favorites, Henry would sell his political soul to “th’altering vulgar, apt for changes still” (*CW* 1:86.7).⁹⁸ Needing to consolidate his power, Daniel’s Henry “seekes the publike best t’accommodate: / Wherein, Iniustice better doth then Right” (3:8.6-7). The new King plays “upon th’aduantage of the peoples hate” (3:8.4) to remove enemies, while employing others “in their steed, such as were popular” (3:9.1). Moreover, while Richard’s notorious spending had been selfishly profligate, Henry’s lavishness seems politically self-serving; his sumptuous coronation is designed “all t’amuse the world, and turne the thought / Of what & how ’twas done, to what is wrought” (3:6.7-8). In a characteristic tactic, Shakespeare dramatizes opposing positions on Henry’s popularity/populism by allowing two speakers to voice the same critique. Richard’s vivid yet harsh diatribe generates sympathy for Henry through the implication that the King banished his cousin out of envy, while York’s comparison of Henry’s self-awareness to “a well-graced actor” (5.1.23) exploits Puritanical anxieties of performance and “seeming” to portray Henry as a political player. The Hayward passage in the paragraph above, building on Shakespeare’s imagery and technique, generates a similar ambivalence through the addition of the analytic afterthought: “...taking that to bee courtesie which the severer sort accompt abasement.”

⁹⁸ In 1596, Bacon wrote to Essex advising that his “popular reputation” should be “handled tenderly,” especially in front of the Queen; quoted in Spedding 9:41.

Working like a dramatic aside, this authorial comment interrogates intention, reception, *and* the interrogation itself (as a manifestation of severity), raising a whole range of possible motivations for Henry.⁹⁹

Daniel, Shakespeare, and Hayward are not writing to a fixed agenda, however; each takes a distinct position on the issue of Henry's appropriation and consequent organization of power. Daniel of the 1595 *Civil Wars* is perhaps the harshest critic of Henry's populism, Hayward the most considerate; Shakespeare characteristically occupies an ambivalent middle ground. Yet they all offer constructive critiques of a concern that is central to Essex's "popular faction." Moreover, Daniel's revisions to the early books of *The Civil Wars* suggest another kind of circulation. Daniel's condemnation of Henry's popular appointments -- "And in their steed, such as were popular, / 'Belou'd of him, and in the peoples grace" -- is significantly ameliorated in the 1609 rewrite in which the nominations are no longer "Belov'd of him," but are "well-deserving, [and] aduanc't by grace" (3:9.1-2). Sensitive to his popular support base rather than enslaved by it, Daniel's Henry now exercises sound judgment to the benefit of his country, much as Hayward's Henry prefers the policy of persuasion in removing corrupt lords (fo.112). In a series of subtle yet extensive revisions to his 1599, 1601, and 1609 editions of the *Civil Wars*, Daniel deftly approaches the other Essexian writers in developing a more tolerant portrayal of Henry: the triangulation of sources continues to circulate in revision. Other

⁹⁹ Hayward favors the parenthetical "aside" as a rhetorical tactic that allows the writer/speaker to formulate dicta on an event or character -- Richard's "only remedy was patience (a cold comfort), his only revenge was complaint (a weak weapon)" (77) -- or to insert subtext. For instance, Hayward potentially undermines the sincerity of Henry's ingenuous complaint that Mowbray later betrays to Richard by reminding us of the source of the account: "And this he said (as he said), not for any grudge, but for grieve and goodwill" (43).

passages of probable source triangulation between Daniel, Shakespeare, and Hayward that are absent from the chronicles include: Richard's resignation of the crown (2:119; 4.1.200-22; 88); Henry's entry into London on Richard's "Roan Barbary" (2:61.4; 5.5.77-80; 85); and the heaping of rubbish upon Richard's head by the London populace (2:62.3-4; 5.5.3ff.; 85). This textual triangulation strongly suggests that Daniel and Shakespeare were the chief non-chronicle and non-classical historical sources to which Hayward was indebted.

Enriching the intertextuality, visual echoes throughout *Henrie III* create what James Loehlin calls an "observational quality" that suggests Hayward's indebtedness to Shakespeare: Loehlin focuses, for instance, on the way in which Hayward builds upon both Holinshed and Shakespeare in his examination of the genesis of the Percy rebellion and the King's alleged maltreatment of Mortimer.¹⁰⁰ We should be wary of too-readily ascribing Hayward's dramatic passages to the playwright. Hayward's aural evocation of the Battle of Shrewsbury -- "the harmonie of hell: trumpettes, fifes, drums. [...] The kinges side cry[ing] 'St. George!' The other parte [...] 'Esperance Peircie' (fo.66) -- certainly sounds, even feels, Shakespearean:

Now *Esperance!* Percy! And set on!
 Sound all the lofty instruments of war,
 And by that music let us all embrace.
 [...]

The trumpets sound.

(Hotspur, *1H4* 5.2.96-101)

Yet both Hayward and Shakespeare drew on Holinshed: "then suddenlie blew the trumpets, the kings part crieing, 'S. George! Upon them!' the adversaries cried,

¹⁰⁰ James Loehlin, "The Politics of Rebellion in Holinshed, Shakespeare and Hayward," unpublished, Shakespeare Association of America, 2007.

‘*Esperance! Persie!*’ and so the two armies furiously joined” (3.523/1/57). When inclined, the chroniclers were perfectly capable of adding dramatic spin to the major events of their histories.

That said, the chroniclers, who were concerned to draw morals rather than rich character studies, made little effort to distinguish patterns of speech or psychologically realized modes of expression. Hayward’s history, conversely, with its focus on human causation over providential dogma, brims with idiosyncratic personalities. Hayward dismisses some with his elegantly incisive phrasing -- like Sir Nicholas Brambre, “in whome the abundance of wealth supplied the want of honest qualities” (12). Others articulate their own peculiarities: “swounes and snayels, let us [...] kill every man and mother’s child” (19), “the “very madcap” Sir Hugh Lynn importunes Richard of the rebels. As even this short speech reveals, Hayward was not an especially subtle or gifted dramatist, and it is hardly surprising that his most vivid characterizations draw on Shakespeare. Here, for example, is Aumerle, the Duke of York’s son who in *Richard II* begs forgiveness for his involvement in the Abbot of Westminster’s plot to overthrow the newly crowned Henry: “For ever may my knees grow to the earth, / My tongue cleave to the roof within my mouth, / Unless a pardon ere I rise or speak” (*R2* 5.3.29-31).

Notwithstanding the measured blank verse characteristic of the play as a whole, Shakespeare’s speech conveys the verbal struggle required of the actor. In his confession, Hayward’s Aumerle seems almost to enact the playwright’s embedded direction:

Then, with a confused voice and sad countenance, casting down his eyes as altogether abashed, partly with feare of his daunger, and partly with shame of his discredit, he declared unto the king all the manner of the conspiracie.
(124)

As if remembering the moment in performance, Hayward vividly conjures both the expression and the motivations that drive it. In Holinshed, Aumerle simply kneels (3. 514/2/10).

Loehlin points out similar observational qualities in passages that articulate the grievances between Henry and the Percies concerning the release of the Earl of March (*IH4* 1.3 and fo. 49) and in the exchanges preceding the Battle of Shrewsbury (*IH4*, 5.3 and fo. 54v-fo. 56v). Once again, the vocal traits of the two Hotspurs are particularly striking. Hayward's Hotspur replicates the increasing exasperation with which Shakespeare's Hotspur, "drunk with choler" (*IH4* 1.3.127), attempts to control his tongue in front of Henry:

[B]eing in [the King's] presence his behaviour was humble and his wordes respective, but his harte was bigge and full of furious courage, whereby his voice trembled, his cheeks changed, & much paine it was for him to continue in modest temper (fo. 49).

The actor inaugurating the role of Hotspur appears to have made a strong impression upon Hayward. Visual references to *Richard II* and the two *Henry IV* plays, then, compound with textual echoes and rhetorical parallels to indicate that Shakespeare's dramatic renditions of Richard and Henry exerted a defining impact upon Hayward's historical narrative.

Haywardian characterization seems to have resulted from the symbiosis of Tacitean invention, Essexian political analysis, and Shakespeare's dramatic sensibility. Hayward peoples his narrative with characters whose depth derives both from their idiosyncratic personalities and from the multiple causes offered as possible motivations for their actions. Richard's courtiers flatter "either upon niceness to discontent the king,

or negligence to discharge their dutie” (5); Richard listens “either upon a generall delight to be tickled in the eares with such tales, or upon particular desire to have some quarrel” (30). And beneath the surface of any deed policy always lurks. The young Henry’s admirably restrained victory speeches are “modest, rather extenuating his fact than extolling it,” writes Hayward, before adding: “But by stopping his fame, it much encreased when men esteemed his high thoughtes by his lowely wordes” (25). In contrast to his sententious maxims Hayward’s characterization here is neither satirical nor judgmental but balanced and comprehensive. For him, political action assumes something of the complexity of psychological motivation.

Collective reasoning, what we might call political decision-making, receives similarly considered analysis. The rebellious nobles under the Abbot of Westminster turn against Henry either “for favor to King Richard [...] or for envy to King Henrie, [...] or for dishonours received in the late parlament; or for disdaine to see others goe before them in the princes favor” (117). Hayward lays out the options in a manner that Worcester’s ghost in the 1559 *Mirroure for Magistrates* might dismiss as mere evasion: “For fear I thinke lest trouble might he trip, [...] Thus story writers leave the causes out, / Or so rehears them as they wer in dout.”¹⁰¹ Yet to the politic historian the onus on reading a character is placed on the reader in a manner that recalls the kind of political analysis Essex sought from his private secretary Robert Naunton:

Study men and actions as you were wont to do books. Take not the pretend cause of the state or the cause of the multitude, but gather out the circumstances

¹⁰¹ ‘The infamous ende of Lord John Tiptoft Earle of Wurcester, for cruelly executing his princes butcherly commaundementes,’ 1559, in *The Mirror for Magistrates*, ed. Lily B. Campbell (New York: Barnes & Noble, 2008), 199.

of the action it selfe as many causes as you can and thinke when you have founde that which is most probable it maye stande for that which is most true.¹⁰²

Character and event are contingent and relative rather than preordained or permanent, a matter of probability over certainty. And here, as Manning notes, Hayward most nearly approaches Shakespeare in representing historical events:

His characters -- like Shakespeare's -- are independent agents exercising their will upon the national stage, not fatal victims: they neither piece out blindly the designs of an intervening providence, nor mimic anachronistically the themes of subsequent political interpretation. Earlier writers' providential sense of history gives way in Hayward's work to a sensibility much like Shakespeare's: it is character that is fate.¹⁰³

Where Manning offers an apolitical reading, however, I contend that Hayward and Shakespeare's strategic impartiality responds to, and comes to characterize, the output of the literary wing of the Essex faction, its self-improving ideology and its self-determining aspirations underpinned by an acute analysis of its head. The political process is thus given a human face.

It is worthwhile noting here that the intertextuality between Shakespeare's *Henriad* and *The Second Part* of Hayward's *Henrie IIII* appears to be entirely memorial, based on the recollection of performance. The lack of textual echoes from either part of *Henry IV* suggests that *Richard II* (published in 1597) was the only Shakespeare quarto to which Hayward had physical access. From this lack, we can hypothesize about the composition of Hayward's sequel covering the next three years of Henry's reign, which was discovered as a scribal copy in the Drake library at Shardeloes in Buckinghamshire

¹⁰² Hammer, "Essex and Europe" 379-80.

¹⁰³ Manning 42.

in 1628, sold to the Folger in 1924, and not published until 1992.¹⁰⁴ The obvious assumption is that Hayward began the sequel sometime in March 1599 in response to the popularity of *Henrie IIII*, but that within months his endeavor ran foul of the Bishop's Order prohibiting the printing of English histories "except they be allowed by some of her majesties privie counsel."¹⁰⁵ Yet while the printer John Wolfe testified at the hearing of July 1600 that a continuation on commercial grounds was indeed under way, Hayward, at the same hearing, conceded only to its potentiality: "He [Hayward] had in intention -- as he saith -- to have continued his hystorie."¹⁰⁶ Given its significant passages of memorial indebtedness perhaps some of *The Second Part* was written while Hayward was in the Tower. When Elizabeth challenged Hayward's authority, Bacon responded: "Nay Madam, he is a Doctor, never rack his stile; let him have pen, ink, and paper, and help of books, and be enjoined to continue the story where it breaketh off, and I will undertake by collecting the stiles to judge whether he were the author or no."¹⁰⁷ If some of *The Second Part* were indeed written in confinement, then the text of Shakespeare's *I Henry IV* -- a key memorial source for the sixth and final section dealing with the Percies, Mortimer, and Owen Glendower (fo.47- fo.78) -- was not among the "helpful books" to which the confined historian was given access.

¹⁰⁴ Whoever contributed to the library during this period seems to have had an interest in politic historiography. Besides Daniel's *The First Part of the Histoire of England*, Hayward's *The Lives of the Three Normans, Kings of England* (both 1612), Bacon's *Henry VII* (1629) and Mathieu's *The Heroyk Life and Deplorable Death of Henry the Fourth* (1612), translated by Edward Grimeston -- the Anglo-French team who would supply the material for Chapman's *Byron* plays -- this Stuart reader also possessed a copy of Greneway's translation of Tacitus's *Annales* (1622); see Manning 51, n. 165.

¹⁰⁵ Quoted in Manning 24.

¹⁰⁶ PRO SP 12/275, 29 and 278, 17.

¹⁰⁷ *Sir Francis Bacon his Apologie*, quoted in Spedding 2:150.

The uncertain relationship between *Henrie VIII* and its dramatic sources highlights a key aspect of both Hayward's paratexts and the trial records: the absence of a stated affiliation by either party between the history play (or any kind of dramatic poetry) and Hayward's dramatic historiography. Scholars skeptical of Hayward's ambitions to enter Essex's literary circle interpret Hayward's silence as proof of non-cooperation between authors. "The part, if any, of Daniel's *Civil Wars* or Shakespeare's *Richard II* is too small for consideration," S. L. Goldberg concludes in a footnote, while Heffner dismisses the whole matter: "If Hayward had used Shakespeare's play, he would [...] have mentioned it in the course of his examination."¹⁰⁸ Having established a demonstrable level of intertextuality between Hayward, Shakespeare, and Daniel, I now find Heffner's remarks especially disingenuous. While Early Modern writers were notoriously reticent in citing sources, historians grounded their very legitimacy on authority and Hayward's defense relied heavily on historiographic precedence, namely that he took both his data and his rhetorical tactics from "the example of the best historians."¹⁰⁹ When challenged by Coke to reveal his sources, Hayward acknowledged Hall, Vergil, Walsingham, Foxe, and William of Malmesbury as his factual authorities, with Boethius ("Bodius"), Bodin, and Ascham offering philosophical support.¹¹⁰ The list is remarkable as much for its

¹⁰⁸ See S. L. Goldberg, "Sir John Hayward, 'Politic' Historian," *The Review of English Studies*, 6.23 (1955), 237, and Heffner (1930), 766.

¹⁰⁹ PRO SP 12/278, 20.

¹¹⁰ See Edward Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustrate Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke*, commonly called *Hall's Chronicle* (1547); Polydyore Vergil, *Historia Anglica* (1534); Thomas Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana* (1377-92); John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (popularly called *The Book of Martyrs*), 1563; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regnum Anglorum* (c.1122-27); Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy* (c.524); Jean Bodin, *The Six Books of the Republic* (1576); and Roger Ascham, *The Scholemaster* (c.1568).

exclusions as for its inclusivity. Holinshed's absence might be explained by the fact that Hall, from whom Hayward claimed to have "selecte[d] out this single history," was imported wholesale from the *Chronicles*.¹¹¹ But the striking absence of Tacitus, extolled as a purveyor of posterity in the "A.P. to the Reader" (62), cited in marginalia, and extensively paraphrased, surely exposes Hayward's growing anxiety over the Roman historian's notoriety, especially amongst his judges. As such, Hayward was prepared to commit the sin of omission under interrogation in order to avoid this association. His judicious silences, in other words, may well have been less innocent than Heffner suggests.

In the final section of this chapter I want to consider whether Hayward's silence about Shakespeare in particular and the drama in general was the product of a similar political anxiety or if, as A.R. Braunmuller suggests, the studious young historian was simply reluctant to admit that a "satisfactory (re)imagining or (re)enactment of the past is worth stealing or imitating, even if it comes from a play."¹¹² Braunmuller's implication that Hayward's evasiveness was motivated in large part by cultural snobbery is perfectly plausible, at some level even probable, yet I discern a more profound equivocation in Hayward's defense of his historiographic tactics, particularly the manner in which he plays with time through dramatic invention, license, and anachronism. Exploiting drama's capacity to re-animate the past, Hayward does more than popularize history (though this is a significant intention); he resurrects and releases it from its providential narrative. By bringing to life historical events and persons, Hayward enacts a

¹¹¹ PRO SP 12/278, 20.

¹¹² A.R. Braunmuller, "King John and Historiography," *English Literary History* 55.2 (1988), 326.

chronological shift in which the past becomes the present, and the present gains an undetermined -- or re-determinable -- future.

3. Playing with history

The relationship in early modern England between the development of the theater and the public's renewed interest in history, especially in its own chronicles, is widely acknowledged. Kewes estimates that, of the 650 known plays between 1570-1700, some seventy percent of the non-comedies involved historical subjects.¹¹³ History offered the theater its raw material, which the drama then shaped and animated for public consumption. Whether instruments of Tudor indoctrination or reflections of national self-determination, history plays taught "such as cannot reade the discoverie of our English chronicles," wrote Thomas Heywood in *An Apology for Actors*, while they also offered moral instruction by exemplifying the dangers of rebellion and sinful behavior alongside the benefits of "notable and noble attempts."¹¹⁴ During the mid-1590s, the emergence of the Essex Taciteans began to intrude upon this rather cozy relationship between the drama and state-sanctioned historiography. A new political realism that, impatient with the moralizing of the providential chronicler and the antiquarian's reliance on narrative over analysis, sought explanations in secondary, or human, rather than divine causes, and focused on historic personalities rather than on the broader historical context, had a natural appeal for playwrights seeking psychological and political motivations for their

¹¹³ Quoted in Worden, *Historians and Poets*, 82.

¹¹⁴ Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors Containing Three Briefe Treatises. 1 Their Antiquity. 2 Their Ancient Dignity. 3 the True Use of Their Quality* (London, 1612), Fr² and B4^r.

princes and pretenders. Conversely, the playwright's capacity to shape sprawling narratives or equivocal myths into three-hour dramas in which compelling personalities enthralled their audiences with their invented speeches and constructed motivations offered lessons to historians, especially those of a humanist bent, who held with the power of history to educate through examples that have "greater force to stir unto vertue then bare precepts."¹¹⁵

Literary scholars had compelling reasons, however, to avoid association with these stage histories, which were often lambasted as shameful fictions denigrating England's heritage, their claims to veracity subjugated to the formal demands of theatrical production and to the playwright's ego or, worse, his agenda. They are "no images of truth," blasted satirist (and playwright) Stephen Gosson, "because sometime they handle things as never were, sometime they run upon truths, but make them seem longer, or shorter, or greater, or less then they were, according as the poet blows them up with his quill."¹¹⁶ Prefacing Roger Williams' *The Actions of the Lowe Countries* (1618) with what Braunmuller calls a "sneer at native-history-as-drama," Hayward dismisses partisan, populist historians who "extolle, depresse, deprave immoderately; making things not as they are, but as they would have them; no otherwise almost then Comedies and Tragedies are fashioned by their Authors."¹¹⁷ Yet twenty years earlier, in his Epistle to *Henrie III*, Hayward openly acknowledged the suspicion provoked by the "liberty a

¹¹⁵ Hayward, "To the Readers," in Manning 63.

¹¹⁶ Stephen Gosson, *Playes confuted in five actions*, quoted by Meredith Skura in *Shakespeare, the Actor, and the Purposes of Playing* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981), 40.

¹¹⁷ See Braunmuller 325; and Roger Williams, *The Actions of the Low Countries* (London, 1618), A1^r.

writer [...] use[s] in framing speeches, declaring the causes, counsailes and eventes of the thinges done; [...] and when and how he may play upon pleasure” (A4^v).

Hayward selects, prunes, and manipulates his English material with something approaching dramatic license. Like Shakespeare, he compresses the campaigns against the Welsh leader Glendower to dramatize the geo-political fallout from the deposition of Richard II as a clash of mighty personalities (fo. 13); like Shakespeare following Daniel, he prematurely weds the eleven-year-old Isabel to Richard to allow her a tragic declamation before she is returned to France (fo. 4-6).¹¹⁸ “Hayward’s sources,” writes Manning, “are at every turn made to conform to his own sense of the human tragedy being played out in his dramatic narrative.”¹¹⁹ And throughout these dramatic manipulations Hayward costumes Henry in Essex’s clothes. For instance, Hayward’s description of Henry’s foreign campaign as being “the onely service (as I suppose) which the English and the Frenchman performed together without jotte or jarre” (31), reminds the reader of Essex’s Normandy campaign of 1591, which, though militarily inconsequential, forged a life-long friendship with Henry IV of France and defined his reputation as a Francophile statesman (a reputation Chapman later exploits in his *Byron* plays).¹²⁰ Oratorical invention, factual manipulation, and empathetic animation -- the qualities that, according to their advocates, rendered stage histories educative and

¹¹⁸ Hayward’s confusion between which of two Mortimers – an uncle and his nephew -- was Richard’s chosen successor (fo.50) is a common error from Holinshed followed by many historians of the period, not least Shakespeare (*IH4*, 1.3.144-5).

¹¹⁹ Manning 40.

¹²⁰ For details see Hammer, *Polarization*, 94-8.

entertaining¹²¹ -- were the chief charges the Privy Council leveled against Hayward's history.

Much was made of Hayward's histrionic style by his prosecutors and by subsequent critics like Edmund Bolton (c.1575-1633), who wished that the historian had "not changed his Historical state into a Dramatical."¹²² While Hayward's defense that his invented speeches emulated "the example of the best historians"¹²³ (presumably from Tacitus and Cicero back to Herodotus and Thucydides) was irrefutable, such fictions were denigrated by the growing expectation on the continent of historical accuracy. "[B]efore the English had had the chance to absorb early humanist historiography," Levy notes, "the attacks on it had already begun."¹²⁴ The adoption of the history genre by some of the finest dramatists of the 1590s -- for whom oratorical invention was obviously the *modus operandi* -- could only exacerbate the authorities' suspicions that dramatic historians, like the history players, were secreting sedition in the mouths of former heroes and getting away scot free. Even in poetry, Daniel would later concede in his 1607 edition of the *Civil Wars*, framed speeches spoken by credibly drawn characters "passe as the partes of the Actor (not the Writer) and are receiv'd with great approbation" ("Dedicatorie," 2:7). The more plausible the dramatic invention, the more it blurred the

¹²¹ In *Theatrum redivivum, or, The theatre vindicated by Sir Richard Baker, in answer to Mr. Pryn's Histriomastix* (London, 1662), Baker promotes the superior didactic value of plays over narrative history, "for the Understanding is not onely sooner, and better *Informed*, but is also *Dilated*, and made both more *capable*, and more *capacious*" (136-7); while Thomas Heywood, in *Gurnaikeion; or Nine Bookes of Various History Concernynge Women* (London, 1624), recommends including "Fabulous Jeasts and Tales savouring of Lightness" to entertain "the lesse capable" (A4^v).

¹²² Edmund Bolton, *Hypercritica* (1616), quoted in Levy, "Beginnings of Politic History" 28.

¹²³ SPD 12/278, 20.

¹²⁴ Levy, "Beginnings of Politic History," 5.

boundary between fact and fiction, between data and drama, which in turn undermined official efforts to assign culpability -- especially when the prosecutors' grasp of their sources was similarly tenuous.

Coke's interrogation of the placement of the twin orations -- both Hayward inventions -- that fashion the ethical and political debate at the center of *Henrie III* (fo.60-67 and fo.101-10) suggests one such judicial confusion. In the first speech, the Archbishop of Canterbury ratifies the unfortunate necessity of deposition with a series of classical and European precedents that "cleare this action of rarenesse in other countries, & noveltie in our" (67). Later, the Bishop of Carlisle counters the rebel position by reaffirming the primacy of divine authority in such matters: "For the power and authoritie of wicked princes is the ordinance of God; and therefore Christ told Pilate" (104). Although the evocative "staging" of Canterbury's speech in an imagined embassy to Paris is more theatrically elaborate than anything in Tacitus and lends credence to the deponents' position, Hayward's rhetorical management of Carlisle's counterattack in Parliament appears to favor the anti-deposition argument. Speaking both last and longest, Carlisle also benefits from classical and scriptural marginalia that gives the oration, in Manning's words, the feel of "a legal brief crafted on the civil law pattern."¹²⁵

Coke nonetheless read sinister implication into the suspicion that Hayward chose to give the ethical argument to an historically arraigned traitor: "for the confutation the Bishop was committed to the Marshalsea, and the whole Parliament concluded against

¹²⁵ Manning 143, n. 104. Hayward's blending of dramatic scenario with extra-dramatic, or extra-textual, marginalia is a literary tactic that was replicated in Jonson's *Sejanus* (1603) and Daniel's *Philotas*.

the Bishop, who in 1 Hen. IV was attainted for treason.”¹²⁶ In fact, whatever slippage Coke suspected between historical fact and invention likely derived from his own experience as a spectator, for it is Shakespeare, not Hayward, who is guilty of the historical gerrymandering Coke perceives. Where Hayward closely follows the chronicles,¹²⁷ *Richard II* re-situates Carlisle’s speech to the moments preceding the deposition, thereby legitimating Carlisle’s defense of divine monarchy while rendering illegal his subsequent arrest by Northumberland within the protected confines of the Houses of Parliament. We might ask how much of the evidence Coke used to prosecute Hayward’s historical invention was itself derived from a playwright’s dramatic license. The ambiguity could well have prohibited the prosecutors from directly accusing Hayward of theatrical affiliations of which they themselves might be guilty.

This said, Coke’s accusations of pervasive temporal manipulation within the historical narrative are justified and, I will argue, point to a deeper theatrical influence. The catalogue of factual disputes drawn up in preparation for Hayward’s first interrogation is more than a canny lawyer’s attempt to trap his defendant in the fine print of history. Points five and six in particular reveal blatant anachronisms that Hayward would have to defend at both hearings:

5. by yearly and double subsidies taxes and fiftenths where h 2 [Henry II] conquered Ireland and made continuall warres and never demaunded subsidie and yet lefe 9000000^{li} besides his Jewels and plate
6. greate sommes gathered under the favorable name of Benevolence.¹²⁸

¹²⁶ SPD 12/275, 41.

¹²⁷ See Holinshed 3, 512/2/29 and side note.

¹²⁸ PRO SP 12/275, 41.

In notably judicious terms, Hayward justifies transferring Henry the Second's £900,000 legacy into the coffers of Henry the Fourth by claiming that he took it "to be lawfull for any historiographer to insert any hystorie of former tyme [in this case, from Fox's *Acts and Monuments*] into that hystorie he wright albeit no other historian of that matter have meved the same."¹²⁹ Hayward's defense might have appealed to a common lawyer's belief in the authority of precedent, but it also gave the lie to his persistent denials that his own history possessed contemporary application: after all, according to his own procedures, history is inherently reusable.

Hayward's dubious tactic of borrowing from the past to fashion his later history pales in comparison with his antithetical tendency to plunder the future for historical anachronisms. "[U]nder the "favourable terme of benevolence," Hayward claims, Richard "wiped away from the people [...] heapes of money" (55) to pay for his ruinously expensive Irish expedition of 1399. Yet the OED (*n.* 2) dates this "forced loan or contribution levied without legal authority" to 1473 in the reign of Edward IV, and attaches an apposite addendum: "Sometimes loosely applied to impositions elsewhere." When challenged to justify his errant claim, Hayward "confesseth he had red of a Benevolence in the tyme of R3 and not before and yet that he inserted the same in the raigne of R2."¹³⁰ Caught in the act of inserting future events into an historical narrative, a malpractice Levy considers "patently inexcusable,"¹³¹ Hayward found himself on shaky ground when, at the second hearing, Coke, perhaps sensing accomplices, subjected the historian to a raft of teleological challenges with implicit factional resonance. Six months

¹²⁹ PRO SP 12/278, 20.

¹³⁰ PRO SP 12/278, 20.

¹³¹ Levy, *Tudor History* 261.

in the Tower had afforded Hayward time to prepare for questions he knew he would likely face again, and his vague, cryptic responses sound contrived rather than extempore: the young civil lawyer was equivocating for his life with the Attorney General.

Hayward argued that Richard's own assertion that "princes must not rule without limitation" (56) implied simply that "princes were to be limited by the law Divine and the law of nature only," and that he "had this from a book written three years since *but cannot remember the author*." He claimed to "find in Hall and others that [Henry] was of popular behavior, but for particulars he took the liberty of *the best writers*," and he again defended his invention as "a libertie used by *all good wrighters* of historie" [all my italics]. As for benevolences, Hayward replied simply that he "had found the matter, but did not defend the word."¹³² "Who were these 'best writers'?" wonders Ernest P. Kuhl, and "why was Hayward unable to name the author of a book three years old?" Might we infer in the subtle difference between the literary "best historians" of antiquity and the "good wrighters of historie" a reference to the playwrights? In the matter of benevolences, textual evidence indicates that Hayward drew upon Shakespeare, that he was aware of the provenance, and that he felt compelled to conceal it.

According to surviving theatrical records, the Ricardian benevolence first surfaced in the anonymous *The Life and Death of Jacke Straw* (1593). In the opening scene, the Archbishop blames the Peasant's Revolt against Richard in 1381 not on the Poll Tax but on the Lord Treasurer's recent innovation: "The Multitude a Beast of many heads, / Of misconceiving and misconstruing minds, / Reputes this last benevolence to

¹³² For Hayward's vague defenses, see PRO SP 12/278, 20.

the King” (1.1.188-90).¹³³ At around the same time, *Thomas of Woodstock* (anon., c.1591-95) -- based on Edward III’s fifth surviving son from whom Essex, Camden reminds us, “feigning a Title [...] derived his pedigree”¹³⁴ -- makes much of Lord Treasurer Tresiliane’s “blank charters” and the “cartloads of money that shall soon follow them” (3.1.24); the play does not, however, specifically refer to benevolences.¹³⁵ Building on the language of both *Jack Straw* and *Woodstock*,¹³⁶ Shakespeare’s Willoughby in *Richard II* bemoans an England bankrupted by grasping flatterers: “And daily new exactions are devised, / As blanks, benevolences, and I wot not what” (2.1.247-51). Whether Hayward consulted or saw the earlier plays, or drew only upon *Richard II*, it is evident that he did not invent this particular historical slippage; the dramatists did.

Another play of the period, Thomas Heywood’s popular *King Edward IV, Parts I and II* (1599) works against the notion that the dramatists, or indeed the historian, were simply promulgating a common historical error. In a scene devoted to the historical levying of the benevolence to pay for the Yorkist restoration in 1471, Justice Aston assures the Lincolnshire burghers that the King, rather than imposing a tax or borrowing more than the country could afford, would “entreat our kindly benevolence, what we

¹³³ *The Life and Death of Jacke Strawe, A notable Rebell in England: Who was kild in Smithfield by the Lord Mayor of London*, 1593, ed. Kenneth Muir and F.P. Wilson (Oxford: Malone Society, 1957).

¹³⁴ William Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England*, 1615 (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1970), 4.57.

¹³⁵ *Thomas of Woodstock, or, Richard II, Part One*, ed. P.C.D. Sedge (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002).

¹³⁶ While Forker, in his consideration of *Richard II*’s dramatic sources, 116-18, disregards the influence of *Jack Straw*, I suggest that Shakespeare’s use of “benevolence,” repeated nowhere else in the canon, confirms the play’s source status for *Richard II*.

would give” (*Part I*, 4.1.25-26).¹³⁷ Performed in the autumn of 1599, against the backdrop of the *Henrie IIII* contention, Heywood’s historical fidelity would have thrown the spotlight onto Hayward’s Shakespearean anachronism. Hayward’s testimony that he had read of benevolences in “the tyme of R3” also suggests that during his defense he had in mind another Shakespeare play, *Richard III*, which prominently features King Edward in its early scenes. And this theatrical undercurrent running through Hayward’s testimony helps to demystify his most obscure statement in defense of historical invention. “There can be nothing done be it never so ill or unlawfull,” he told Coke, “but must have a shadowe, and every counsel must be according to the action.”¹³⁸ Hayward’s employment of this dramatically multivalenced phrase in the service of historiographic clarification warrants scrutiny.

As an optical term, “shadow” defines Hayward’s presiding concern with secondary or human motivations for actions that, in a sense, intercept and obscure the light of divine will. Deducing causation that is largely absent from the formal record enables the politic historian to rationalize the action and give meaning to the whole event. Alongside its more nefarious implications, however, the word was also deployed by playwrights, especially Shakespeare, to signify the (often evanescent) revelation of the inner self -- a “mirror,” Cassius tells Brutus, in which “you might see your shadow” (*Julius Caesar*, 1.2.60) -- along with the embodiment of that reflection, the insubstantial yet subversive actor. “If we shadows have offended, / Think but this and all is mended,” the performer playing Puck entreats the audience at the close of *A Midsummer Night’s*

¹³⁷ *King Edward IV, Parts I & II* (London: Shakespeare Society, 1842).

¹³⁸ PRO SP 12/278, 17.

Dream, both confirming and subverting Theseus's earlier claim that even "the best in this kind [i.e., actors] are but shadows" (*MND*, 5.1.208; Epilogue, 1-2). By employing such a loaded term, Hayward perhaps acknowledges the significance of the drama in developing the role of causation, or motivation, in his historical analysis.

But Hayward also concedes that within his historiographic framework the motivating cause is itself a shadow, a re-action (or performance by an actor) after the event: the motive follows, or shadows, the action. Hayward's statement creates a self-reflexive syllogism in which an event is either the product of causes or else produces causes in order to rationalize it. History becomes a palindrome that can be read both ways. As such, *Henrie IIII* either anatomizes motivations leading to the deposition of Richard in order to better "confute [Henry's] error," as Hayward claimed in court,¹³⁹ or the events of 1399 are generated by motivations operating two hundred years later that render them exemplars for future action. It is hardly surprising, in light of the defendant's obfuscations, that the authorities persisted in interpreting Hayward's history in this front-to-back manner, accusing *Henrie IIII* of "slanders [...] against the government [that] are set down and falsely attributed to these times, thereby cunningly insinuating that the same abuses being now in the realm that were in the days of Richard II, the like course might be taken for redress."¹⁴⁰ The key move the judges make here is to recognize that Hayward's history does more than reflect on the present; it anticipates the future.

¹³⁹ PRO SP 12/278, 20

¹⁴⁰ PRO SP 12/278, 54. The Privy Council drafted this passage as part of a sermon to be delivered from the pulpit on Sunday February 14, 1601, one week after the Essex rebellion.

I want to suggest that Hayward's subtle but persistent defense of anachronism, especially the imposition of later events on an earlier historical period, was encouraged by the theater's ability to render analogies as glasses that reflect beyond the present. However "inexcusable" the anachronism might have appeared upon the page, the early modern stage is replete with misplaced events or objects that in the right hands could create profoundly productive analogies; like the striking clock in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* that speaks to the play's thematic *carpe diem*: the power to control time both in historical and contemporary settings.¹⁴¹ Indeed, the dramatic anachronism demonstrates the historian's capacity to control time, to fold the past and future into the present moment; and, as Hamlet warns Polonius, the past realized by the players has a greater impact than the historical record: "they are the abstract and brief chronicles of the time: after your death you were better have a bad epitaph than their ill report while you live" (*Hamlet*, 2.2.477-78). The most prevalent and powerful anachronism on the early modern stage, Hamlet implies, is the player himself. A familiar face to the audience, the repertory actor not only brings to life historical figures but also serves as the interface between the playwright and powerful contemporaries with ambitious futures. It seems plausible, for instance, that Richard Burbage, who created many of the roles associated with the faction (Henry V and Hamlet are examples discussed in the next chapter), was received as Essex's theatrical surrogate in the later 1590s. As such, we might argue that the actor not only resurrects the dead, he also engages the living. By activating the writer's analogy,

¹⁴¹ For the temporal conflict expressed in the Julian and Gregorian calendars in both the Roman and the late Elizabethan periods, see *Julius Caesar*, Arden 3, ed. David Daniell (London: Longmans, 1998), 16-22.

the performer demonstrates that playing history is also the process of making history, that one man's past can be another man's future.

Using the past to speculate upon the future was precisely what the politic historians on the continent so admired in Tacitus's "lively patterns" through which, Bodin asserted, "not only are present-day affairs readily interpreted but also future events are inferred, and we may acquire reliable maxims for what we should seek and avoid."¹⁴² Where the chroniclers largely confined themselves to reading history and its implications as providential and fixed, the politic historian, in theory at least, viewed the past as flexible and the future as up for grabs. Shakespeare stages this very contention in *2 Henry IV*. Where Henry, the once-optimistic achiever who seized a throne, now reads the "book of fate" as testament to an immutable decline that "make[s] mountains level" (3.1.46), Warwick argues that, by observing history, "a man may prophesy, / With a near aim, of the main chance of things / As yet not come to life" (3.1.82-84). Neither party denies the first cause, the shaping hand of God, but Warwick articulates the Tacitean rationale that secondary causes define how successfully the journey toward one's future is taken. Although *Henrie III* ends each regnal year with an almanac of deaths, accidents, and portentous events, Hayward consistently dissociates himself from superstition and rumor, echoing instead Warwick's politic logic: "Many do suppose that those things which are fatally allotted, though they never be avoided, yet sometimes are foreshewen, not so much that we may prevent them, as that wee should prepare ourselves against them" (52).

¹⁴² Jean. Bodin, *A Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, trans. Beatrice Reynolds (New York: Columbia UP), 9.

Shakespeare seems here to characterize Warwick as the precursor of future English politic historians like Hayward and Bacon.

Yet Shakespeare's passage also diagnoses the danger inherent in the politic approach that indicates why Hayward was so reluctant to assign any debt to the drama. Warwick's attempts to rationalize and codify the speculative possibilities of history are fatalistically and, for the rebels, fatally conditioned by the trenchant language of divination. Although Warwick's statement that "a man may prophesy / With a near aim, [...] the main chance of things" (3.1.77-78) is conditional ("may"), contingent ("near"), and no more than a probability ("main"), Henry turns surmises into certainties, speculation into prognostication: "Are these things then necessities? / Then let us meet them like necessities" (3.1.88-89). Thomas Hobbes would later redefine prophecy as more of a science than an arcane art: "the best prophet naturally is the best guesser; and the best guesser, he that is most versed and studied in the matters he guesses at, for he hath most signs to guess by."¹⁴³ But sixty years earlier, at the turn of the seventeenth century, Hayward found himself trapped in the treacherous slippage between providential and politic prophecy, his "expectation of [Essex's] future greatness" deemed audacious divination at a time when all political speculation invited accusations of treason and immorality.

Conceding any kind of theatrical association would risk bringing Hayward into dangerous proximity with a cast of mighty overachievers who, from the arrival of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* in 1587, had dared to "hold the Fates bound fast in yron chains

¹⁴³ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 1651 (London: Continuum, 2003), 24.

[and] turn Fortune's wheel about" (1:1.2.174-75).¹⁴⁴ From self-defining individuals like Hal, Time's great redeemer, to "stage Machiavels" like Macbeth, Time's beguiler,¹⁴⁵ theatrical princes and generals, so often perceived as shadowing the great courtiers of the day, envisioned futures limited only by the scope of their ambitions and the anxiety of their faith. "'Tis immortality to die aspiring," Chapman's Byron would later declare, confident in his "free-born powers of royal man" (*Conspiracy*, 3.1.31; 1.2.31). To Christian orthodoxy such aspiration challenged the very foundations of divinely elected monarchy, and an ambitious politician like Essex could quickly assume a satanic reputation. "He is the devil," wrote Guilpin, "Brightly accoustred to be-mist his evil: / Like a Swartrussers hose his puffed thoughts swell, / With yeasty ambition."¹⁴⁶ Yet more perilous for the religiously orthodox Hayward, charges of satanic behavior might all too easily migrate to the prophetic historian who, like Marlowe's Faustus exhuming the spirit of Alexander the Great for the edification of Charles V,¹⁴⁷ resurrects the dead for the nefarious advancement of a political master. Beyond anxieties of cultural and intellectual propriety, I read in Hayward's equivocal defense the growing awareness that a Faustian

¹⁴⁴ Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine the Great, Part I*, in *English Renaissance Drama*, ed. David Bevington (New York: Norton, 2002).

¹⁴⁵ "To beguile the time, / Look like the time," Lady Macbeth commands her husband (1.5.61-62). Taught well by his father's example, Hal needs no lesson: "I'll so offend to make offence a skill, / Redeeming time when men think least I will" (*IH4*, 1.3.205-6). For a consideration of the status and role of Machiavelli on the English stage see Mario Praz, *The Flaming Heart: essays on Crashaw, Machiavelli, and other studies in the relations between Italian and English literature from Chaucer to T.S. Eliot* (Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1966).

¹⁴⁶ *Skialetheia*, Satire 1, ll.57-59). Replying to Lambarde's comment that the Essex rebellion was devised by "a wicked imagination," Elizabeth transitions effortlessly between ambition and atheism: "He that will forget God, will also forget his benefactors" (quoted in Barroll, 447).

¹⁴⁷ See 4.1 of *Doctor Faustus*, A-text, *English Renaissance Drama* (New York: Norton, 2002).

reputation could prove fatal in a climate antithetical not only to Essex but to the history plays often associated with him. As such, Hayward could no more confess to knowing of the players than he could admit to playing with history. The equivocation might have cost him his liberty but it saved his life, and ensured his posterity - even if he spent the rest of his life trying to live it down.

4. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have portrayed Hayward as a lawyer who attempted to seize his own time, to fashion a new role for himself as a politic historiographer and advisor in the service of the Earl of Essex. He applied Tacitus to the chronicles and enlivened Tacitus with the animating energy of the history play. The result was a peculiar form of dramatic historiography that explored the psychology of politics through the character of the political statesman, Henry-Essex. Hayward's manipulation of history -- his selective patterning, dramatic anachronism, and poetic license -- might have curtailed his influence upon the new historical methodology, but it also helped free future historians from the "slavish repetition of the chronicler's facts [and] the preacher's moral intent."¹⁴⁸ *Henrie IIII*'s unique synthesis of literary and dramatic history, while rarely repeated in prose,¹⁴⁹ must also have shaped and influenced the exotic theatrical descendants of the English

¹⁴⁸ Goldberg 244.

¹⁴⁹ Having written *Henrie IIII* only four years after Daniel's epic treatment of the same reign, Hayward's history of William the Conqueror in *The Collection of the History of England* (1613) once again closely followed Daniel's *The Lives of the III Normans, Kings of England: William the First. William the Second. Henrie the First* (1612). Despite having both suffered accusations of political analogizing, their prose histories retain all the trademarks of their politic historiographies. However coincidental the publishing dates, it seems that Hayward continued to keep a close eye on Daniel's historical output.

chronicle plays banned by the Bishop's Order of 1599. Daniel's closet drama *Philotas* (1605), Shakespeare's Roman plays along with Jonson's Tacitean *Sejanus* (1603), and Chapman's contemporary French histories, *Bussy D'Ambois* (1603) and *Byron* (1608), all reach for a greater understanding of the psychology (and sometimes the psychopathy) of the political character through the evidence of classical and continental history. In this, I suggest, the history players associated with the Essex circle owe a debt to Hayward.

That this debt could never be acknowledged, let alone collected, by Hayward tells us a great deal about the nature and ambitions of the literary wing of the Essex faction. In the conspiratorial spirit of the 1930s, Kuhl viewed Hayward's disinclination to acknowledge the dramatists as thoroughly intriguing: "It may be that [Hayward] did not wish to incriminate anyone."¹⁵⁰ Inevitably, the "anyone" to whom Kuhl refers is Shakespeare, whose *Richard II* had received unwanted attention from the Revels office two years earlier. A demonstrable collaboration between these two authors might reveal a conspiracy to put Essex on the throne, perhaps with Hayward crafting a manifesto and with the dramatists generating popular support. Yet, whatever roles Hayward imagined for Essex in post-Elizabethan England, deposer was surely not among them. Indeed, other than critiquing the Tudor substitution of aristocratic governors for vulgar bureaucrats¹⁵¹ -- a long-standing gripe of both the Essex and Raleigh factions -- *Henrie IIII* is politically conventional. Pragmatist rather than ideologue, Hayward offers lessons on managing

¹⁵⁰ Kuhl 314.

¹⁵¹ For pointed examples of Hayward's advocacy of the hereditary aristocracy, see *Henrie IIII* 8-9.

(and exploiting) the aftermath of accession rather than a call to rebellion.¹⁵² The collaboration I have explored is tangible but remote, intertextual rather than interactive, and for Hayward largely self-serving. If Hayward was protecting anyone in January 1601, it was surely himself.

On February 7, barely two weeks after Hayward's second interrogation, Essex initiated the ill-fated and short-lived rebellion that would condemn himself and five of his inner circle to a traitor's fate. Having never met Essex, Hayward found himself assuming the burden of guilt for the literary and intellectual wing of the circle. If his equivocations had done little to ameliorate the Queen's suspicions, Essex's rash actions consigned him to an indefinite confinement. Hayward returned to the pen that had recently incriminated him. But this time, abandoning the politic historian's support of shared government, the civil lawyer hastily began re-scripting himself as an advocate of James's benign form of absolute monarchy and protestant royalism, publishing the first of three tracts supporting the Stuart claim, *An Answer to the First Part of a Certain Conference Concerning Succession*, within weeks of Elizabeth's death.¹⁵³ The *Conference* to which Hayward referred was a 1594 treatise forwarding the claim of the Spanish Infanta written by Jesuit controversialist Robert Parsons (under the pseudonym N. Doleman), and provocatively dedicated to Essex as "a man like to have a greater part or swaye in deciding this

¹⁵² Womersely (342) makes a similar claim of Savile's translation of Tacitus, which exemplifies a series of "military commanders making successful, principled interventions in the political life of a nation."

¹⁵³ *A Treatise of the Union of the Two Realms of England and Scotland* (1604) elaborates on the Stuart claim over the Spanish Infanta, while *A Report of a Discourse Concerning Supreme Power in Affairs of Religion* (1606) argues for royal jurisdiction over ecclesiastical affairs; for further details, see Willem de Passe, *DNB*, 2004, and Manning 9-11.

affayre.”¹⁵⁴ Hayward’s rebuttal of Parsons, therefore, also served as a public repudiation of Essex. Together, the tracts pleased a new administration in need of judicial validation, gaining Hayward a speedy release, James’s eternal gratitude, and rapid entry into London’s intellectual elite.¹⁵⁵ In 1610, Hayward was appointed historiographer royal alongside William Camden; he was even admitted to a proposed Society of Antiquaries: his own future as a less politicized historian was secured.

Hayward’s lack of control over his own history as a Tacitean, however, also reveals the enduring power of the posthumous Essex in the political and public imagination. The extraordinary publication history of *Henrie IIII* continued to overshadow Hayward’s life long after Essex’s death. The suppressed second edition was followed by four further print runs (1610, 1625, 1638, and 1642) masquerading as 1599 first editions, all of which attest to the continuing allure of Hayward’s inflammatory dedication. It was not until 1872 that W.C. Hazlitt revealed the flaw in the pretense, a slip contingent upon retaining the key dedication in its correct layout.¹⁵⁶ The leaf recording thirty-four “Faultes escaped in the Printing,” which was redundant in subsequent editions that had amended the errata, had to be retained on the reverse of the dedication: the fakers were caught in correcting their faults. Judging by marginalia found in the five editions of *Henrie IIII* in the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin, these counterfeits reiterate both the publishers’ and their readers’ expectations of the Hayward-

¹⁵⁴ Robert Parsons, *A Conference About the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inghlande*, 1594 (New York: De Capo Press, 1972), A2^r.

¹⁵⁵ Hayward was released at some point between the Queen’s death in March and James’ accession in August 1603, although the exact date is unknown. It seems certain, however, that Hayward wrote *An Answer*, which was entered in the Stationer’s Register only two weeks after Elizabeth’s death, during his incarceration.

¹⁵⁶ For a full account of the afterlife of *Henrie IIII*, see Dutton 330-39.

Essex association. In the margin of the dedication to the 1610 edition a reader notes, “For these words ye author was imprison’d.” On page eleven of the same copy a somewhat more modern script places running quotation marks against a “significant” passage: “Ambition is like the crocodile, which groweth so long as he liveth.” Adding “Ambition” in the margin, the reader apparently confers a *post hoc* judgment on Essex’s fall rather than Richard’s, recapitulating the tactics of the original prosecution in turning the book upon its patron. And the paste down end paper of the 1642 edition contains a makeshift postscript: “This book was referred to in the indictment of the E. of Essex before he was beheaded by Q. Elizabeth.” Whatever Hayward’s significance to the development of English historiography, to posterity he remains the historian who, in attaching a dedicatory head to the body of his text, helped an Earl to lose his own. As the other writers in my study also discovered, literary incursions into the Essex circle were written in indelible ink.

Chapter Two

“This is miching malicho; it means mischief”:¹ Shakespeare and the Politics of Oblique Allusion

Introduction

Although Samuel Daniel's inauguration into the Wilton circle in 1591 probably preceded Shakespeare's by a couple of years, and George Chapman's off-on support for the Earl outlasted his fellow playwright's by almost a decade,² neither has had so many of his works subsequently associated with Essex as Shakespeare has. Some Shakespeare scholars draw largely biographical parallels between Shakespeare's characters and Essex and Elizabeth: the truculent courtier Berowne dueling with the sparky Katherine in *Love's Labour's Lost* (c.1595), the hard-bitten warrior wooing an aging Queen in *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606).³ Yet most affiliations allude to a more troubling political role, to aristocratic dissidence and to rebellion from within. In various Shakespearean figures, Essex has been said to represent a range of attitudes: suicidal aristocratic emulation as Brutus in *Julius Caesar* (1599); the withdrawn Stoic Timon of Athens in the play of his name (1607), or Jacques in *As You Like It* (1599); the apotheosis of factionalism as

¹ Shakespeare quotations are from the most recent Arden edition. I use Early English Books Online for quarto references and Charlton Hinman's *The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1996) for Folio.

² In *The School of Night* (Cambridge: CUP, 1936), M.C. Bradbrook argues that Raleigh's anti-Essex campaign began with Chapman's "School of Night" in 1593; he began dedicating work to the Earl with his Homeric translation of the first four books of *Achilles* in 1598; while his *Byron* plays were written in 1608.

³ Janet Spens was so convinced of the biographical nature of *Love's Labour's Lost* that she contrived from textual enhancement for publication evidence of an amateur performance in which "Southampton took the part of the king, and Berowne was played by Essex," "Notes on *Love's Labour's Lost*," *The Review of English Studies* 7.27 (1931), 331-34.

Achilles in *Troilus and Cressida* (1602); the Senecan overachiever displaced in a new political order in the titular *Othello* (1604) and *Coriolanus* (1608).⁴ And nowhere is Essex more ubiquitous than in Shakespeare's second history tetralogy of 1595-99, which, in dramatizing the succession crises of Richard II through Henry V, engages with the increasingly pernicious parallels between Henry Bolingbroke's deposition of Richard and Essex's perceived threat to an aging Elizabeth. It seems that Essex is everywhere in Shakespeare; like Henry using decoys on the battlefield of Shrewsbury, he "hath many marching in his coats" (*IH4* 5.3.25).

And yet despite these numerous identifications -- or perhaps because of them⁵ -- scholars remain reluctant to portray Shakespeare as an Essex writer. "I am not sanguine about engaging in a critical practice that finds a single historical figure, even one so potent as Essex, in work after work of contemporary fiction," concedes Eric Mallin, even

⁴ For Essex's association with *Julius Caesar* see Wayne Rebhorn, "Crisis of the Aristocracy in Julius Caesar," *Renaissance Quarterly* 43 (1990), 75-111; for *As You Like It* and *Timon of Athens*, see Dixon Wecter, Shakespeare's Purpose in *Timon of Athens*, *PMLA* 43.3 (1928), 701-21; for *Troilus and Cressida*, see Eric S. Mallin, "Emulous Factions and the Collapse of Chivalry: *Troilus and Cressida*," *Representations* 29 (Winter 1990), 145-79; for *Othello*, see Gordon Braden, *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition* (Newhaven: Yale UP, 1985), 153-225; and for *Coriolanus*, see Richard S. Ide, *Possessed with Greatness: the Heroic Tragedies of Chapman and Shakespeare* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1980), 181-94.

⁵ The further towards the outer reaches of the canon the scholarly "deep searchers" roam, the less probable are some of their identifications. It seems no more likely that Shakespeare consciously buried the young Essex alongside the heroic John Talbot in arguably his first play, *The First Part of Henry the Sixth* (c. 1590), than that he resurrected him twenty-three years later to feel the axe once more as the downfallen Buckingham in one of his last works, *All Is True* (or *The Famous History of the Life of Henry the Eighth*). For the former claim, see Titus Willet Conklin, "Shakespeare, 'Coriolanus,' and Essex," *The University of Texas Bulletin: Studies in English* 11, 313 (1931), 42-47, and for Dr. Ward's reading, see Wecter 709.

as he unlocks some of *Hamlet*'s topicality with his "Essex skeleton key."⁶

Unsurprisingly, the plays' recent editors, as guardians of their texts, tend to be most skeptical of Shakespeare's political affiliations, judging it "far from likely [that he] intended to write politically barbed and controversial" histories, whose associations with Essex were "after the fact and [...] fortuitous."⁷ Shakespeare's biographers, despite trading on the vital relationship between text and context, are similarly doubtful. Jonathan Bate does cautiously conclude that Shakespeare's "semi-concealed political intentions" nudge him "only a little over halfway to being an Essex man," but Blair Worden strips the playwright of political agency: "His history plays, it seems to me, display nothing of that *avant-garde* preoccupation with Tacitus and Machiavelli and the new 'politic' history [...] which takes the pertinence of the past to present political concerns as its starting point."⁸ Even new historicists, encouraged by Stephen Greenblatt's iconic essay "Invisible Bullets: Renaissance authority and its subversion" to consider how the history plays "meditate on the consolidation of state power,"⁹ tend to cast factional intrusions into the theater as opportunistic dilettantism and the players and playwrights as self-contained subversives protected from the political realities beyond the playhouse walls. Their "theatrical power," writes Louis Montrose, "did not lie in the specific advocacy of

⁶ Eric Mallin, *Inscribing the Time: Shakespeare and the end of Elizabethan England* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1995), 141.

⁷ *Henry IV, Part 2*, ed. Rene Weis, *The Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998), 35; and *Richard II*, ed. Charles S. Forker, *Arden 3* (London: Methuen, 2002), 10.

⁸ Jonathan Bate, *Soul of the Age* (New York: Random House, 2009), 254-55; and Blair Worden, "Shakespeare in Life and Art: Biography and *Richard II*," in *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*, eds. Takashi Tozuka and J. R. Mulryne (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 30.

⁹ Stephen Greenblatt, "Invisible Bullets," in *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988), 56.

explicit political positions, but rather in the implicit but pervasive suggestion [...] that all such positions are motivated [...] by the passions and interests of their advocates.”¹⁰

Perhaps fearful of reducing (or of being accused of reducing) Shakespeare to a political toady, scholars continue to promote Ben Jonson’s lasting image of a writer “not of an age, but for all time.”¹¹ In this chapter, I shall challenge the notion that, as “an artist,” Shakespeare held no “particular political position,” but also that, as a factional writer, he was *de facto* a propagandist for the Essex agenda.¹²

To present this thesis, I offer factional readings of two plays -- *I Henry IV* (1597) and *Hamlet* (1601) -- that, while they were almost entirely overlooked by the censor, I suggest frame Shakespeare’s active political association with the literary circle around Essex. In this chapter’s central section, “The Earl’s three bodies in *I Henry IV*,” I argue that, contributing to a 1597 public relations campaign to promote Essex as the multifaceted modern governor, Shakespeare’s history play develops his strategy of obliquely refracted allusions. Mallin’s approach to unlocking Essexian topicality involves not a key as such, but a bifocal lens through which the reader/viewer places and displaces historical personalities within one dramatic figure: for Mallin, Hamlet consecutively hosts both Essex and James I. (For Annabel Patterson, similarly, Henry V is variously Essex and Elizabeth.)¹³ Where Mallin’s concave lens mainly enriches the drama by

¹⁰ Louis Montrose, “Shakespeare, the Stage, and the State,” *U of Wisconsin P*, 25.2 (1996), 63.

¹¹ Ben Jonson, “To the memory of my beloved, the Author, Mr. William Shakespeare,” 1623 Folio.

¹² Worden 26.

¹³ See Mallin, *Inscribing the Time*, 151, and Annabel Patterson, “‘Back by Popular Demand’: The Two Versions of *Henry V*,” *Renaissance Drama* 19 (1989): 29-62. I would like to acknowledge the importance of Mallin’s twin studies of *Hamlet* and *Troilus and*

focusing multiple contemporary personalities upon a megatherial theatrical persona, I suggest, however, that Shakespeare's mirror (his favored allusive conceit) reflects both ways. By refracting Essex's "megalopsyche" among a series of often competing vessels, Shakespeare constructs a richly instructive analysis of the aristocratic yet anarchic energy that resides in various proto-rulers or pretenders to the throne. Eschewing propaganda for the humanist tradition of advice-giving, *1 Henry IV*, I argue, promotes Essex's impressive political ubiquity while concurrently interrogating the implications of a governor whose many roles risk leaving him discontented and overexposed.

Within the context of Shakespeare's second history cycle, *1 Henry IV* marks the apotheosis of Shakespeare's evasive strategies. In *2 Henry IV* (1597), *Henry V* (1599), and, I shall argue, the re-commissioned *Richard II* of 1601, the playwright makes his factional affiliations increasingly transparent in progressively censored texts. In "*Hamlet*: an afterthought," I propose that this process of self-revelation becomes almost confessional when Shakespeare, perhaps for the only time in his career, reshapes extant material to inflect his own sense of betrayal by a faction that was willing to appropriate his history plays for seditious ends. Building on the extraordinary parallels between the *Richard II* re-commission and *The Mousetrap*, both plays that recycle and revise historical drama for the purposes of political insurgency, the 1601 *Hamlet* offers an acute critique of the fraught mismatch between a political patron and his history players. The fact that *Hamlet* wasn't censored, but instead became the iconic drama of the age,

Cressida in my following analysis of Shakespeare's allusive methodology. Although I formulated my thesis of refracted representations of Essex in *1 Henry IV* before coming to Mallin's work, the similarity of our approaches suggests a methodological correspondence between Shakespeare's later histories and the Roman plays that superseded them.

perhaps implies tacit acknowledgment of Shakespeare's apostasy by an authority that between 1595 and 1599 had become increasingly concerned over the factional elements in his second tetralogy. I therefore begin this analysis by considering first the relationship between Shakespeare and the censors, and then how this relationship impacted the one he was developing with the intellectual wing of the Essex faction.

1. Shakespeare and the Censors

In assessing the potential relationship between Shakespeare and Essex, scholars focus largely on three textual cruxes and one perplexing theatrical event involving three plays: the excision of the "deposition scene" (*R2* 4.1.155-318) from the first three quartos of *Richard II* (1597-98) and its recovery in the first Jacobean quarto of 1608; the Falstaff versus Oldcastle controversy and its connection to Essex's political adversary Lord Cobham in *2 Henry IV*; and *Henry V*'s description of Essex returning as a "conquering Caesar" (*H5* Ch. 5.0.22-34) from the Irish expedition of 1599, which was cut from the Q1 (1599) and not recovered until the Folio (1623). Adding a perplexing coda to the issue, *Richard II* was re-commissioned, six years after its premiere, by Essex's steward Sir Gilly Meyricke and key members of the faction, for a bespoke performance at the Globe on the afternoon preceding Essex's fateful rebellion of 7 February 1601. The explanation of why *1 Henry IV*, the second play of Shakespeare's second tetralogy, has escaped factional consideration is perhaps indicated by a similar occlusion in Janet Clare's exhaustive study of early modern censorship, *'Art made tongue-tied by authority'* (1990). Clare's work features sections on *Richard II*, *2 Henry IV*, and *Henry V*, as well as one on

the associated Cobham libels in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1599).¹⁴ Yet, considering the re-naming of Falstaff in the first of the Henry plays as collateral damage from the later plays, Clare denies *1 Henry IV* a discrete analysis presumably because it did not independently provoke the censor. Within the terms of her study, Clare discerns ideological infringement strictly through the empirical lens of censorship. In the past three decades, both Clare and Patterson, in her seminal study *Censorship and Interpretation* (1984), have rightly identified censorship, as a manifestation of state authority and anxiety, as one of the key indicators of political intentionality in dramatic authors of the early modern period.¹⁵ Yet this rubric, while astute, has its limits, and it is worth taking a moment to consider how the kinds of censorship Shakespeare endured both associate him with and distinguish him from his fellow Essexian writers.

Clare defines three orders of censorship: the rare manuscripts bearing signs of official interference prior to performance; the more common printed quartos whose textual variations indicate post-production interference; and commentaries upon these intrusions by the authorities in state papers or by the authors in prefatory remarks and letters to patrons.¹⁶ The most celebrated manuscript in the narrow first category, *Sir Thomas More*, written somewhere between 1593 and 1603 and usually attributed to Anthony Munday, seems to feature Shakespeare's involvement as Hand D in some

¹⁴ Janet Clare, *'Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority': Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990).

¹⁵ The work of Richard Dutton, in *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1991), offers further critical ballast, especially with regard to the suppression of Hayward's history.

¹⁶ Clare, *'Tongue-tied by Authority'* x-xi.

collaborative additions.¹⁷ Yet it is unlikely that Master of the Revels Edmund Tilney, who inscribed Munday's foul papers with excisions and commands for revision as prerequisites for licensing, ever read the additions.¹⁸ There is, in fact, no evidence that any of the writers in this study endured such premature interference.

The commentaries upon censored works, which make up Clare's third category, certainly offer critical evidence for understanding the level of state interference with the work of Hayward, Daniel, and Chapman. As we have already seen, the Elizabethan State Papers Domestic offers an extensive record of the Crown's case against Hayward. In preparing their materials, the prosecutors even retained the single copy of the "Epistle Apollogetical" intended for the second print run of *Life and Raigne of Henrie IIII*, which was burned under the Bishop's Order of June 1599 in a government crackdown on satires and seditious histories. Due to what Manning calls an "unfortunat[e] hiatus in the *Acts of the Privy Council from 1601-13*,"¹⁹ however, only fragmentary official records remain of either the *Philotas* or *Byron* affairs of 1605 and 1608. Even the examination of Augustine Phillips, actor and housekeeper in the Chamberlain's Men, who was called on 18 January 1601 to defend his company's involvement in the Essex rebellion, is tantalizingly brief. Admitting to receiving forty shillings "more than their ordynary" (i.e., the box office) for

¹⁷ For discussions on the authorship of "Hand D," see *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More: Essays on the Play and Its Shakespearean Interest*, ed. T.H. Howard-Hill (Cambridge: CUP, 1989).

¹⁸ In "Playwrights at Work: Henslowe's Not Shakespeare's, 'Book of Sir Thomas More'," *English Literary Renaissance* 10 (1980): 439-79, Carol A. Chillington argues that Tilney's excisions were prompted in 1603 by anxieties of potential unrest following the Essex rebellion. However, like most critics, Clare contextualizes the play against the race riots in London in 1593; see *'Tongue-Tied by Authority*,' 30-37.

¹⁹ *'The Tragedy of Philotas' by Samuel Daniel*, ed. Laurence Michel (New Haven: Yale UP, 1949), 37.

playing *Richard II* for Essex's men, Phillips offered the further professional defense that he "and hys fellowes were determynd to have played some other play, holdyng that play of Kyng Richard to be so old & so long out of use as that they should hav small or no Company at yt."²⁰ Although Chapman was considered the "chief culprit" in the *Byron* affair, Shakespeare's absence, at least from the records that survive, suggests he was not called to defend himself either as playwright, actor, or company shareholder.

Filling in the patchy official record, paratextual materials and private correspondence offer the critical evidence for understanding the level of censorial intrusion endured by both Daniel and Chapman. Indications that the Privy Council accused Daniel of creating a dangerous parallel between Philotas and Essex come almost entirely from his own pen. Letters to his patron Charles Mountjoy and to Secretary Cecil allude to a "sknedulous [scandalous] misconceiving" of Daniel's *Philotas* and to his "great erro^r" of dragging Mountjoy's name into a Privy Council hearing; while the play's belligerent Apology, although unpublished until 1623, concedes that his dramatic "History [had been] applied to the late Earle of Essex," to whose bounty he had once been "perticularly beholding."²¹ Chapman, whose two letters to his patron the Duke of Lennox on the subject of *Byron*'s suppression are undated and unsigned, leaves even less of an historical imprint.²² Indeed, without the partly-coded communiqués of French ambassador Antoine de la Boderie to his Secretary of State, in which he boasts of having

²⁰ *Calendar of State Papers Domestic (CSPD)* 578.

²¹ Michel 37-39 and 155-57.

²² The "Dobell letters" were discovered by Bertram Dobell in the Folger Library in 1901 and published in *The Athenaeum*; they are quoted in full in *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron*, ed. John Margeson, The Revels Plays (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1988), Appendix II, B, 278-79.

twice forced the suppression of the *Byron* plays in 1608, textual scholars would be at a loss to explain what provoked the censoring of the “poore dismembered poem” Chapman dedicates to his patrons Sir Thomas Walsingham and son.²³ Shakespeare, however, is notoriously niggardly with posterity, leaving barely enough verifiable data, according to George Bernard Shaw, for a “half-hour sketch.”²⁴ Shunning puff pieces and pleas for patronage, self-critiques and literary manifestos, Shakespeare lets his work speak for itself and, possibly, for him. “If his biography is to be found, it is in the plays and poems,” writes Barbara Everett, adding cautiously, “but never literally and never provably.”²⁵

In contrast to the other writers in this study, then, evidence of Shakespearean censorship is confined almost exclusively to Clare’s second category of textual interference in quartos based on foul papers or performance scripts and between subsequent quartos and folios, the analyses of which are inherently speculative, never provable. The “deposition scene” in *Richard II*, for instance, continues to generate heated debate.²⁶ Was the 160-line passage in which Richard freely hands the usurping Bolingbroke the crown, cut by the Revels Office, as Peter Ure presumes, or by the press

²³ For a translation of de la Boderie’s letter and for Chapman’s epistle, see Margeson, 276-77 and 67.

²⁴ Shaw’s comment appears in a review of Frank Harris, *The Man Shakespeare* (1910), is reprinted in John Gross, *After Shakespeare: An Anthology* (Oxford: OUP, 2002), 10.

²⁵ Barbara Everett, “Reade him, therefore,” *TLS* Commentary, August 17, 2007, reprinted in Bate xix.

²⁶ For a summary of this debate, see Cyndia Susan Clegg, “‘by the Choise and Invitation of Al the Realme’: *Richard II* and Elizabethan Press Censorship,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48.4 (1997): 432-48.

censor, as Andrew Gurr argues?²⁷ Was the scene performed on the stage while excised from the page -- which Ray Heffner considers “obvious”²⁸ -- or is Clare correct in finding it “difficult to see why what was a dangerous subject for public discussion was not equally hazardous when presented in the theater”?²⁹ Some commentators question whether the cut occurred at all. Taking the 1608 Q4 title page’s promise of “new additions of the Parliament Sceane” at face value, Bate asserts that there is “no evidence of active censorship,” which he calls “an enduring misapprehension even among some distinguished Shakespeareans.”³⁰ As Forker’s editorial analysis reveals, however, Q1 “indicates an attempt to bridge the hiatus” between Carlisle’s arrest (4.1.154) and Bolingbroke’s declaration that “on Wednesday next we solemnly proclaime our Coronation” (4.1.319-20), with the half-line “Let it be so, and loe,” a clumsy addition removed from Q4 once it had become redundant.³¹ Whereas the quarto cuts to Chapman’s banned work, by removing large sections of two acts, effectively rendered *Byron* unplayable, the *Richard II* excisions retain a cohesion that suggests the scene was performed in its entirety in 1595. Yet who instigated the cuts -- an official censor (either the Bishop of London or the Archbishop of Canterbury) or a timid publisher -- and

²⁷ Gurr sees “the pattern of censorship in playbooks [as] quite different” to that of printed books. In his argument against the cuts being made by the Revels Office, he also points out that the subsequent “restoration [of the deposition passage] would have been unique in the history of the drama at this time”; see *Richard II*, (Cambridge: CUP, 1984), 9-10. For Ure’s opinion, see *Richard II*, Arden 2 (London: Methuen, 1956), 9.

²⁸ In “Shakespeare, Hayward, and Essex,” *PMLA*, 45.3 (1930), Heffner argues that “the actors’ copies must have retained this scene, else the play would have been useless for the purposes of the conspirators on the afternoon of February 7, 1601” (774).

²⁹ Clare, *Tongue-tied by Authority*, 55. Clare lays out her arguments more fully in “The Censorship of the Deposition Scene in *Richard II*,” *The Review of English Studies* 41.161 (1990), 89-94.

³⁰ Bate 244.

³¹ Forker 516-17.

whether Shakespeare complied with, perhaps even performed the textual re-stitching, remains unknown.

Issues of both authorial and censorial intention are even more complex in *2 Henry IV*, which was probably written in late 1597, in a political climate increasingly hostile to playwrights,³² and published in 1600, while Essex was under house arrest for deserting his Irish command. Q1 exhibits no fewer than eight major cuts, four of which may have simply reduced a long play (1.1.166-79; 1.3.21-24 and 36-55; and 2.3.23-45); yet the rest, claims A.R. Humphreys, excise “passages of political import” (1.1.189-209; 1.3.85-108; and 4.1.55-79 and 103-39.)³³ Since these latter excerpts deal with the aims of the rebels and their spiritual endorsement by an Archbishop of York who, much like Hayward’s Archbishop of Canterbury, “Turns insurrection to religion” (1.1.201), we can probably assume that the Revels Office, refusing to countenance a high-ranking member of the Church of England articulating contemporary resistance theory upon a public stage, executed the cuts with what Ure calls “a gross disregard of the dramatic niceties.”³⁴

Yet *2 Henry IV* also endured interference from outside the state mechanisms and therefore beyond the official record. In a dedicatory epistle “To my Noble friend Sir

³² Following the furor at the Swan in August 1597 surrounding Dekker’s libelous *The Isle of Dogs*, which seemingly attempted to circumvent licensing through the improvisations of its cast, the Privy Council ordered the demolition of all playhouses within three miles of the City. Although it was never executed, Clare, *Tongue-tied by Authority*, 54, speculates that the order operated like a suspended death sentence threatening future infringements.

³³ *King Henry IV, Part 2*, Arden 2, ed. A.R. Humphreys (London: Methuen, 1980), lxx-lxxi.

³⁴ Ure lxxii.

Henry Bouchier” (presumably a distant relative of Essex’s³⁵) written in the early 1620s, Dr. Richard James, librarian to Sir Robert Cotton and a friend of Ben Jonson, recalls that, as “Shakespeare’s first shewe of Harrie the fift” featured a “buffone” called “not Falstaffe, but Sir Jhon [sic.] Oldcastle,” offence was “worthily taken by personages descended from his [title].”³⁶ Scholars broadly agree that William Brooke and his son Henry, the Lords Cobham, who were descendents to the fifteenth-century Lollard martyr, were the affronted aristocrats who forced the retraction in 2 *Henry IV*’s Epilogue: “for “Oldcastle died martyr, and this [Falstaff] is not the man” (31-32). But there is little consensus over the rationale behind the risky “Brooke-baiting” that persisted into *Merry Wives* (c.1597),³⁷ written while William Brooke was briefly Lord Chamberlain and therefore Shakespeare’s company’s patron.³⁸ Yet, although she acknowledges Henry Brooke’s key role in the Cecil-Raleigh-Cobham faction that challenged Essex at court in the late 1590s, Clare resists making a factional connection between the Oldcastle libels

³⁵ Contemporary dedications, including Hayward’s in Latin, address Robert Devereux [Devorax] Earl[e] of Essex and Eu [or Ewe], Viscount of Hereford and Bouchier, and Lord Ferrers of Chartley, Bouchier and Louvain.

³⁶ See David McKeen, *A Memory of Honour: The Life of Henry Brooke, Lord Cobham* (Salzburg: Universitat Salzburg, 1986), 22-3. James’s erroneous identification of Falstaff with *Henry V*, in which he never recovers from his offstage sickbed, either underscores the fragility of the records of censorship or suggests that contemporaries, like many modern scholars, thought of the second tetralogy collectively as a “Henriad.”

³⁷ G.P.V. Akrigg, *Shakespeare and the Earl of Southampton* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1968), 156.

³⁸ In *Merry Wives* jealous Master Ford, in his disguised visit to Falstaff, adopts the Cobham family name of Brooke as his pseudonym. Offence was presumably taken once more and the name was changed to Broom in Folio. In a letter to Cecil, dated February 1598, moreover, Essex suggests that a mutual friend, Sir Alex Ratcliffe, should be informed that his sister “is married to Sir Jo. Falstaff,” a reference to the current gossip that the lady was in fact involved with Lord Cobham. Following Oldcastle’s renaming as Falstaff, writes Humphreys, xii, “Sir Henry’s enemies, it seems, promptly rechristened him likewise.”

and the legitimacy of Bolingbroke's rebellion, judging "these two instances of censorship [that] ensued from different sources [as] unrelated." At most, Clare concludes, the 1597 plays suggest that "Shakespeare was entering, albeit marginally, the arena of factional conflict which dominated Court life during the last years of Elizabeth."³⁹ Once again, the playwright/player is politically sidelined.

It is difficult to reconcile this supposed marginality with Shakespeare's decision the following year to nail his, and presumably his company's, colors to the Essex mast. In the fifth act Chorus of *Henry V*, performed in the summer of 1599 -- "smack in the middle of the Hayward/Essex crisis," notes Patterson⁴⁰ -- Shakespeare inserts what Gary Taylor calls "the only explicit, extradramatic, incontestable reference to a contemporary event anywhere in the canon."⁴¹ Commonly cited as a rare instance of Shakespeare's succumbing to the popular mood only to find himself overtaken by events, his over-determined passage in fact bristles with factional innuendo and political ambiguity:

But now behold,
In the quick forge and working-house of thought,
How London doth pour out her citizens!
The mayor and all his brethren in best sort,
Like to the senators of the antique Rome,
With the plebeians swarming at their heels,
Go forth and fetch their conquering Caesar in:
As, by a lower but loving likelihood,
Were now the general of our gracious empress,
As in good time he may, from Ireland coming,
Bringing rebellion broached on his sword,
How many would the peaceful city quit
To welcome him!

(*H5* Ch. 5.0.22-34)

³⁹ Clare, *Tongue-tied by Authority* 68 and 78.

⁴⁰ Clare, *Tongue-tied by Authority* 46.

⁴¹ *Henry V*, ed. Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1982), 7.

Replicating the blend of Roman, medieval, and modern temporalities that characterizes the Tacitean historiography of the period, Shakespeare collapses three historical periods upon one another. Audiences are asked to imagine, almost concurrently, medieval Blackheath to the east of London,⁴² the Roman City, and its western fringes welcoming three conquerors: Henry V, Caesar, and Essex. The stakes residing in the similes could not be higher. Are London's citizens and courtiers like those who elected a Caesar or those who would kill him for the sake of the commonwealth? Does the "general" support his "gracious empress" or seek the support of "the peaceful city"? Does he return with rebellion vanquished or to vanquish with rebellion? (In *I Henry IV*, after all, Bolingbroke describes Worcester as "a portent / Of broached mischief to the unborn times" [5.1.20-21].) Above all, does Shakespeare in this moment obliterate the Tudor myth that unifies the monarch and the military leader in the body of Henry V or are the historical strands raveled up within the figure of Elizabeth? Deftly resisting easy interpretation, Shakespeare's Chorus nonetheless operates like an embedded dedication that strikingly echoes Hayward's "expectation of a future time" when a populist Essex might "go forth among the people."⁴³ Against the backdrop of the Essex hearings, in which the authorities decoded Hayward's expectation as aspiration, it is "hardly surprising," notes Patterson, that such representational ambiguity was excised from the published quarto.⁴⁴ More surprising is why an apparently apolitical Shakespeare wrote the passage at all.

⁴² Holinshed records that "the mayor of London, and the aldermen apparelled in orient grained scarlet, and foure hundred commoners clad in beautifull murrie [...] met [Henry V] on Blackheath" (3.556/1/28); see also *Shakespeare's Holinshed*, ed. Richard Hosley (New York: Capricorn, 1968), 198.

⁴³ Manning 61.

⁴⁴ Patterson 53.

Published in the poisonous atmosphere generated by the book burnings demanded by the Bishop's Order,⁴⁵ the 1600 Q1 indicates that the authorities -- or at least someone with *authority* -- were alert to *Henry V*'s emerging factionalism. Severely reduced from the later Folio, which at 3,381 lines is more than twice as long,⁴⁶ Q1 manifests stringent efforts to extract Ireland and Essex's role in its affairs from *Henry V*. Along with the now inappropriately triumphal Choruses, including the reference to Essex's Irish campaign, Q1 also loses Macmorris, the Irish captain who questions the validity of nationhood (3.3.124), and the scheming Bishops of 1.1, who remind the audience of the undermining effect of domestic corruption upon foreign military expeditions (a frequent, and increasingly vociferous, complaint of Essex's⁴⁷). If, as Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield have persuasively argued, Henry's French campaign is a barely concealed "re-presentation of the attempt to conquer Ireland" and unify Britain,⁴⁸ then Shakespeare's *Henry V* joins Samuel Daniel's Second Book of the *Civil Wars* (1595) and Edmund

⁴⁵ In all, nine books were burned in the grounds of the Palace of the Bishop of London. For details, see Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 198-217.

⁴⁶ For a discussion of the textual variations between Q1 and Folio, see *Henry V*, ed. T.W. Craik, Arden 3 (London: Thomson, 2000), 11-19.

⁴⁷ On January 1 1599, as he began preparations for the Irish campaign, Essex wrote to Fulke Greville, "I know I leave behind me such a company as were fitter to watch by a sick body than to recover a sick State," while, three days later, he conceded to Lord Willoughby that he was "not ignorant of the disadvantages of absence; the opportunities of practicing enemies when they are neither encountered nor overlooked"; quoted in G.B. Harrison, *The Life and Death of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex* (London: Cassell and Company, 1937), 212.

⁴⁸ Dollimore and Sinfield, "History and ideology: the instance of *Henry V*," in *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed. John Drukakis (London: Routledge, 1985), 225.

Spenser's *A Viewe of the Present State of Ireland* (1596) in imagining how Ireland might shape Essex's political future.⁴⁹

That any discussion of Ireland at this time, factional or otherwise, was punishable by death, suggests to Clare that Tilney wielded the knife on *Henry V*.⁵⁰ Yet Patterson, in a brilliantly inverted reading of Folio to Quarto as “a tactical retreat from one kind of play to another, from a complex historiography that might have been misunderstood to a symbolic reenactment of nationalist fervor,” maintains that only the playwright could have enacted the wholesale revision that “produced another kind of story” for another century.⁵¹ Patterson confers political intentionality, though of very different kinds, on both Shakespeare's factional *Henry V*, which was not authorized for print until 1623, and on its patriotic Q1 that hastily removed offending passages in 1600. Critically, her “extratextual or topical” reading also encourages Patterson to view *Henry V* as part of a broader engagement between Shakespeare and Essex.⁵² In “'The Very Age and Body of the Time, His Form and Pressure': Re-Historicizing Shakespeare's Theater,” a companion essay published the same year as “Back by Popular Demand,” Patterson situates *Henry V* in relation not only to the *Richard II* commission the following year, but also to its possible reflection in *Hamlet*, which debuted within months of the Essex rebellion.

⁴⁹ For a discussion of Spenser and Daniel's writings on Essex and Ireland, see my Daniel chapter, 193-96.

⁵⁰ Clare, *Tongue-tied by Authority* 72.

⁵¹ Patterson, “Back by Popular Demand” 41 and 55.

⁵² Patterson, “'The Very Age and Body of the Time, His Form and Pressure': Re-Historicizing Shakespeare's Theater,” *New Literary History* 20.1 (1988), 98.

Although to Patterson the “cobwebs of topical allusions” between Shakespeare and Essex cannot be “brush[ed] away,”⁵³ the unwillingness of Clare, along with *Richard III*’s recent editors, to endorse the notion of a politically motivated playwright speaks, I suggest, to a fundamental conflict of methodologies. Where Clare requires proof of censorship, Patterson reads the spaces in a text that, she willingly concedes, are the product of an evasive author’s attempts to render that very “interpretation unreadable by erasing it.”⁵⁴ At the same time, the reactive nature of censorship undermines its own stability as evidence, a point not lost on the playwrights. By definition, dramatic censorship, especially Clare’s second category of interference inscribed in printed plays, is a retrogressive reaction applied after composition and, usually, performance. This gap between creation and recreation offered authors an almost impregnable defense against accusations of libel or topicality.⁵⁵ Building on his plea to Cecil that his “innocent” history of the Greek general Philotas had been “misapplied” to the contemporary Essex, in an “Apology” that carefully logs his compositional process, Daniel asserts that *Philotas*, which he had begun “eight yeares since,” had been overtaken by “the late Tragedy of ours [the Essex Rising], whereunto this is now most ignorantly resembled.”⁵⁶ All the authors in this study, save the discretely silent Shakespeare, likewise plead that

⁵³ Patterson, “Back by Popular Demand” 29.

⁵⁴ Patterson, “Back by Popular Demand” 53. Craik writes that, “*Henry V* would have been written if Essex had never gone to Ireland,” 5, while Clare, ‘*Tongue-tied by Authority*’, similarly argues that the play’s “sense of momentous occasion [and] optimism [...] could be applied to any popular military hero and any campaign,” 73.

⁵⁵ It is worth recalling that, despite months of concerted effort to tie *The Life and Raigne of Henrie IIII* to a broader Essex conspiracy to dethrone Elizabeth, Attorney General Coke failed to convict Hayward of any charges.

⁵⁶ See Michel 38 and 156.

their innocent texts acquired toxicity through altered political contexts quite beyond their original scope or the playwrights' subsequent control.⁵⁷

Filling in the silence, editors take a broadly similar view of Shakespeare's later histories, which, containing no treason themselves, "did not eliminate the treasonable purposes for which [they] might be used."⁵⁸ For Peter Ure, the bespoke performance of *Richard II*, which was commissioned years after the play was first written and performed, is exemplary of this kind of *post hoc* dissidence: "There is no reason at all to suppose that what Essex's followers hoped would have a seditious effect in 1601, had been composed by Shakespeare some six or seven years earlier with a seditious intent."⁵⁹ In his consideration of the politics of *I Henry IV* (which, it's worth noting, contains no mention of Essex), Arden editor David Scott Kastan concludes that, while "literary texts do have politics, [p]lays mean differently at different times, in different places, their politics always newly created within different conditions of representation, for different readers and spectators." Above all, Kastan asserts, a play's politics "are provoked rather than produced, [and] never monopolized either by authorial intentions or by textual effects."⁶⁰

In their attempts to discern authorial intention and political motivation in Shakespeare's second tetralogy, historicist scholars clearly face challenges both from their editorial colleagues -- who perpetuate the enabling notion of Shakespeare's

⁵⁷ In his "Epistle Apologieticall," for instance, Hayward complains of the "deepe searchers of our time" who find quarrelsome conceits" in interpretations "meant of an other tyme (although nothing like) then that whereof it was reported"; quoted in Manning 65.

⁵⁸ Forker 16.

⁵⁹ *Richard II*, ed. Peter Ure, Arden 2 (London: Methuen, 1956), lviii.

⁶⁰ *King Henry IV, Part I*, ed. David Scott Kastan, Arden 3 (London: Methuen, 2002), 40.

timelessness -- and from the cruxes within their own evolving methodologies. Taken together, as here, the interconnectivity between Shakespeare's later histories and the concerns of the Essex faction seems undeniable, creating "lively patterns" (to use the Tacitean buzz phrase favored by other Essexian writers) that were legible to the censors. Yet when the resulting erasure or overwriting of those texts was unaccompanied by authorial protest or official reprimand, as was always the case with Shakespeare, subsequent attempts to read or make sense of the lacunae, however brilliantly postulated, are textually unsupported and, by definition, speculative. As a result, Shakespeare, in contrast to the other writers in this study, is left in political limbo, his associations with the Essex faction conceived, if at all, in the vaguest of terms.

In the previous chapter, I suggested that the intertextuality of the politically sensitive Plantagenet histories of Hayward, Daniel, and Shakespeare offers one way of making visible the operations of the intellectual wing of the Essex faction, which developed a peculiarly dramatic historiography to enliven history's lessons for an aspiring patron. This chapter focuses on certain of Shakespeare's texts that, I shall argue, evaded the clutches of the censor while actively pursuing or retroactively critiquing the Essex enterprise. If, as Patterson argues, Shakespeare was a master of the "prudential strategies of [self-] representation" that rendered detection less of a science than an art,⁶¹ then the increasingly expurgated texts of *Richard II*, *2 Henry IV*, and *Henry V* imply that, between 1595 and 1599, he became either less masterful or more brazen. Either way, I want to suggest that Shakespeare's oblique and refracted allusions in *1 Henry IV* and his exploitation of retrograde dissidence in *Hamlet* demonstrate the complexity of his evasive

⁶¹ Patterson, "The Very Age and Body of the Time" 90.

tactics, the sophistication of his factional analysis, and his high expectations of his audience. Moreover, examining texts more or less free of external interference produces speculation on text rather than its absence -- on what audiences might have taken from the plays rather than what might have been removed from their texts by the censor.

2. Shakespeare and the Essex Circle

Due in part to the personalities involved and in part to cultural constraints, the relationship between Shakespeare and Essex remains unknown. Albeit at different social levels, both men were public figures who exerted extraordinary control over the dissemination of their professional personas, the one burying himself within his theatrical creations, the other, in Hammer's words, "relentlessly seeking public endorsement for his actions."⁶² Essex's promotion to Privy Councilor in 1593, moreover, instigated a deep commitment to intelligence gathering and analysis that enhanced the favorite's intimacy with the Queen while frustrating later historians' access to the Earl. "Ciphers and obscure language are a frequent (and intentional) barrier to understanding," bemoans Hammer, who understands Essex better than any other scholar, "while a great deal of evidence has been lost through the ravages of time and the deliberate culling of files."⁶³ Although we

⁶² Paul Hammer, "'The Smiling Crocodile': The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan 'Popularity'," in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007), 95.

⁶³ Hammer, *Polarization of Elizabethan Politics*, 152. Hammer also quotes William Camden's description of the burning of files immediately prior to Essex's final arrest in February 1601 "lest they tell tales," 308, n. 206.

know that Essex watched Shakespeare's plays during this period,⁶⁴ his surviving correspondence makes no direct reference to the playwright.

Love's Labour's Lost, likely written in 1594, offers the first clues in Shakespeare's writing of some kind of relationship between the two men. To those who interpret the play as a complex battle between the two major court factions of the day,⁶⁵ King Ferdinand's reference to "the School of Night" (*LLL* 4.3.251) would have alerted audiences to Shakespeare's satirical target: the nefarious scientific, and allegedly atheistic, society headed by Sir Walter Raleigh. Usually included in the group were the "Wizard Earl" Henry Percy, the Catholic theater patron Ferdinando Stanley, astronomer Thomas Harriot, Spanish translator John Florio, and Italian intellectual Giordano Bruno: all men with shady reputations in the popular imagination. Managing public relations for the group fell to George Chapman, a role that, according to Muriel Bradbrook, made him the opposite number to Shakespeare, who, alongside Daniel, was a quasi-literary spokesman for the Essex circle. Chapman's arcane poem *The Shadow of Night* (1594), so the theory goes, offered Shakespeare an easy target and the school its satiric name.

It seems plausible that The School of Night controversy encapsulated a series of minor skirmishes in a literary war conducted between a Raleigh faction in decline⁶⁶ and

⁶⁴ See *n.* 38.

⁶⁵ The chief proponents of the School of Night theory, which has fallen from critical favor in recent years, are: Arthur Acheson, *Shakespeare, Chapman, and 'Sir Thomas More'* (New York: Edmund Byrne Hackett, 1931); Havelock Ellis, *Chapman* (London: Nonesuch Press, 1934), and M.C. Bradbrook, *The School of Night* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1936); Akrigg, 1968.

⁶⁶ Elizabeth never forgave Raleigh for his illicit marriage to Elizabeth Throckmorton in the spring of 1592; for details, see J.H. Adamson and H.F. Folland, *The Shepherd of the Ocean: An Account of Sir Walter Raleigh and His Times* (Boston: Gambit, 1969), 199-203.

an Essex faction in the ascendant. Within this fray, the political ambition of *Love's Labour's* was low key, its aims primarily to ridicule authors and court figures, but Shakespeare's tone -- courtly, connected, *au fait* -- suggests a recent upgrade in his social standing. Akrigg speculates that, during the prolonged closing of the theaters between 1592 and 1594, Shakespeare "decided against demotion to the wearing and dismal life of a touring player" and stayed in London to "establish himself as a man of letters."⁶⁷ During this time, he became acquainted with patron and theater lover the Earl of Southampton, to whom he dedicated *Venus and Adonis* (c.1593) and for whom, according to Akrigg, he was commissioned to write a series of sonnets (1-17 in the sequence) extolling the virtues of marriage, but which actually reflected some kind of love affair between the writer and his young patron. Shakespeare would have been introduced to Southampton's intimates, including his closest friend Essex. The connection might have afforded Shakespeare access to avant-garde literature and continental thinking,⁶⁸ perhaps to private letters and semi-private circulars, and certainly to court gossip. From here on, Shakespeare would always have the scoop.

Financially and emotionally, membership in an elite group comes at a price, and it seems that from 1595, in return for his privileged access, Shakespeare began to politicize areas of his work in aid of an Essex agenda. While Essex's foreign intelligence and military skills were reaping benefits in the Privy Council, he was making little headway

⁶⁷ Akrigg 195.

⁶⁸ D.R. Wolfe makes the point that writers required elite contacts to gain access to private libraries and heterodox literature; see "Erudition and the Idea of History," *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.1 (1987), 11-48.

against the “regnum Cecilianum”⁶⁹ that monopolized the ear of the Queen. Hammer discerns a distinct change of tactics within the faction from 1594 whereby Essex “sought to advertise his capabilities by other, more public means”: re-staging Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta* in 1594 to coincide with the execution of Elizabeth’s physician Dr. Lopez, whose confession Essex personally wrought;⁷⁰ co-authoring with Francis Bacon the self-aggrandizing masque *Of Love and Self-Love* at the Accession Day tilts in 1595; attempting to publish the *True Relacion* following the triumphant Cadiz expedition of 1596;⁷¹ and disseminating epistolary travel advice to the Earl of Rutland as a “semi-public and semi-anonymous way of sharing and publicizing [his] political views.”⁷² “Such actions, clustered together so closely and involved such elaborate preparation,” writes Hammer, “that it is hard not to conclude that Essex launched a deliberate propaganda campaign.”⁷³

When Shakespeare began composing his second tetralogy sometime in 1594, the Essex publicity drive was therefore already underway and, at some level, the playwright onboard. *Richard II*, although written when Essex enjoyed Elizabeth’s full favor, might be considered part of that campaign. Not only was Essex, as we have already noted, a

⁶⁹ An anonymous pamphlet from 1585 accused Burleigh of instigating a “Regnum Cecilianum”; quoted by Pauline Croft in “The Reputation of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6.1 (1991), 46.

⁷⁰ For Essex’s involvement in the restaging of Marlowe’s play, see M. Hotine, “The politics of anti-Semitism: *The Jew of Malta* and *The Merchant of Venice*,” *Notes and Queries* 236 (1991), 238.

⁷¹ Hammer, “Myth-Making: Politics, Propaganda and the Capture of Cadiz in 1596,” *The Historical Journal* 40.3 (1997), 621-42.

⁷² Alexandria Gajda, “*The State of Christendom*: history, political thought and the Essex circle,” *Historical Research* 81.213 (2008), 429.

⁷³ Hammer, *Polarization of Politics* 144.

descendant through Bolingbroke's wife Mary, heiress of the de Bohun and Bouchier earldoms of Hereford and Essex, many of Essex's closest friends were also related to Henry's supporters in the play: Sir Charles and Sir Jocelyn Percy to the first earl of Northumberland and his son Hotspur; William Parker, 4th Baron Monteagle, to Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk; Essex's friend and son-in-law the Earl of Rutland to the Yorks and their son Aumerle. Among many other ancestral connections referenced by Hammer, these particular associates also attended the re-commissioned play at the Globe six years later. In both 1595 and 1601, in other words, Shakespeare's version of Richard's deposition offered the theatrical aficionados of the Essex circle "a very direct and personal connection to the action."⁷⁴ Shakespeare's historical figures dramatically reinforced for both their public and coterie audiences the notion that Essex was a figure of historic importance surrounded by fellow history makers.

Written two years later, in the afterglow of a triumphant Cadiz expedition *I Henry IV*, I suggest, was received by a primed audience as a continuation of this factional campaign to position Essex as the powerbroker behind a throne that must soon be vacated. In the previous chapter, I discussed Elizabeth's enduring association with Richard while noting that Daniel inaugurated the Bolingbroke-Essex analogue in *The First Fowre Bookes of the civile wars* in 1595.⁷⁵ Influenced by the *Civil Wars*, *Richard II* was also published in this year, presumably to exploit the excitement generated by *I Henry IV*, and the excision of its deposition scene likely contributed to the promise of

⁷⁴ Hammer, "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February 1601, and the Essex Rising," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 60.2 (2009), 29-30.

⁷⁵ See my Hayward chapter, 46-47 and 62-64. In the upcoming Daniel chapter, 18-21, I discuss eleven "Essex stanzas," cut from the 1599 edition, that draw a clear genealogical line between the Earl and Bolingbroke.

illicit material in its sequel. In the summer of 1597, as I have also noted, the factions began openly to endorse the analogy. In a letter written in July to Cecil, which discusses an “enterteynement” enjoyed by all three men, Raleigh records that Essex “was wonderfull merry att ye consait [conceit] of Richard the 2,” adding ominously, “I hope it shall never alter [for] all our good [and] for her [Elizabeth’s] sake.”⁷⁶ If we accept that *I Henry IV*, performed in the late spring of 1597 prior to a summer shutdown of London’s theater,⁷⁷ is the likeliest candidate to have entertained Essex and disturbed his rivals, we are then confronted with the Earl’s curiously “merry” response. After all, only eighteen months later, Essex reacted bitterly to Hayward’s dedicated history by writing a “cold formal letter to my Lord of Canterbury to call it in again.”⁷⁸ In the following section I argue that the Shakespearean conceit that so delighted Essex in 1597 was both more complex and less dangerous than the crass correlation promoted by rivals determined to portray him as King “Robert the First.”⁷⁹ Rather than seeking correspondences between Essex and his ancestor, I chart his migration among the play’s three Henrys: the King, his son, and their rival, Hotspur.

⁷⁶ The letter is reproduced by E.K. Chambers, in *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1930), 1:353.

⁷⁷ For the likely performance date of *I Henry IV*, see Kastan 76-77. Rene Weis, editor of the Oxford Shakespeare *2 Henry IV* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 7-16, suggests that the sequel was probably performed in the late fall of 1597, following a court performance of an intervening *Merry Wives*.

⁷⁸ Sir Francis Bacon, his Apologie,” 1604, reprinted in James, Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, *The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*, 14 vols, (London: Longman, 1874), 3.150.

⁷⁹ MS HM 41952, Henry E, Huntington Library, San Marion, CA, fol. 39^v; cited in Hammer, “Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising,” 4.

3. The Earl's three bodies in *1 Henry IV*

During the Battle of Shrewsbury, which occupies the final act of *1 Henry IV*, King Henry, desperately defending his newly won throne against his alienated northern allies, deploys tactics that the chivalric Hotspur and the ferocious Douglas consider unheroic and unethical. Believing he has slain Henry on the field, Douglas is informed by Hotspur that he has in fact killed a decoy, Sir Walter Blount. "The King hath many marching in his coats," says Hotspur, to which Douglas retorts, "I will murder all his wardrobe" (*IH4* 5.3.25-27). In a subsequent encounter, Douglas's ironic description of Henry as just "Another king!" deploys Holinshed's image of "so many kings [arising] one in the necke of an other" (3.523/2/39)⁸⁰ to describe the monstrous implications and dangerous precedent of even this most benign form of royal pretension: "They grow like Hydra's heads" (5.4.23). In Book Four of *The Civil Wars*, Daniel's politic analysis of the same event betrays no such anxiety:

For *Henrie* had divided, as it were,
The person of himselfe, into foure parts;
To be lesse knowne, & yet known every where,
The more to animate his people's harts:
[...]
By which, two special things effected are;
His safetie, and his subjects better care.
(*CW* 4.51.1-8)

The division of the royal body, far from weakening Henry's position and status, becomes an effective strategy of self-protection that also, paradoxically, reveals itself through concealment. It is perhaps to be expected that Daniel's critical methodology, developed

⁸⁰ Raphael Holinshed, *The Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 3 vols. (London, 1587).

among the Taciteans of the Wilton School,⁸¹ should echo Essex's own strategies of self-promotion at court, where, from various platforms and in numerous forms, he "often sought to disguise his political actions behind uncontroversial appearances or the names of others."⁸² I propose, however, that this style of refractive self-promotion also shaped Shakespeare's method of oblique allusion.

At the climactic moment of *Richard II*'s deposition scene, the famously vain Richard,⁸³ having 'undone himself' by freely passing his crown to Henry, reacts to his reflection as a private individual by hurling his hand mirror to the ground:

Is this the face which faced so many follies,
That was at last outfaced by Bolingbroke?
As brittle as the glory is the face! [*Shatters glass.*]
For there it is, cracked in an hundred shivers.
(*R2* 4.1.285-89)

Operatic yet heart wrenching, this moment of Shakespearean invention captures the superstitious anxiety of providential rule challenged by monarchical innovation. Just as dynastic upheaval threatens to break Lear's heart into "an hundred thousand flaws" (*KL* 2.2.438), so too Bolingbroke's challenge physically and figuratively fragments Richard (although his narcissistic histrionics suggest that he has brought his bad luck largely upon himself). Richard's royal aura, which he consistently likens to the majestic rays of the sun, proves in fact so earthbound and brittle that, once challenged, to use Francis Bacon's scientific rationale, it "breaketh not onely, wher the immediate force is; but breaketh all

⁸¹ For details, see my Daniel chapter, 180-82.

⁸² Hammer, "The Smiling Crocodile" 98.

⁸³ According to his biographer Nigel Saul, Richard "showed an almost obsessive interest in projecting and manipulating his own image"; see Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven, Conn.; Yale UP, 1997), 238.

about into shivers.”⁸⁴ The remainder of Shakespeare’s cycle becomes, in a sense, a recycling of these shards, each broken piece of the mirror reflecting various aspects of the prince from medieval monarch to modern Machiavel as it ultimately reassembles to form a composite image of the contemporary ruler in the figure of Henry V. Shakespeare’s later histories, writes Catherine Lisak, make “contextualization lose all transparency. Mirrors [shatter] into smithereens. Viewpoints [are] multiplied by textual, political and historical superimpositions which, in turn, [affect] the concept and construct of a character or scene. Irrepressible layers of meaning [come] shuffling on stage at once.”⁸⁵ If Lisak’s pointed phrasing implies that these “shuffling” figures embody alternating and evasive allusions and insinuations,⁸⁶ I suggest that Essex is both first and foremost among them.

I Henry IV is hyperaware of its schizophrenic structure and subjects. Geopolitically, the text’s internal binaries interrogate and comment upon one another: the various courts (Whitehall, the Tower, the Boar’s Head in London; Bangor, York, and Warkworth in the provinces); the conflicting energies of suppression, rebellion and carnival; the vibrant dialects and competing modes of expression, all depict a vital but dangerously disjointed nation that requires a huge force of will to reassemble its many shards. Yet our opening encounter with Henry, whose first regnal year of “intestine shock [and] civil butchery” following Richard’s deposition has left him “shaken [and] wan with care” (*IH4* 1.1.1-13), suggests that such a restoration is beyond him, that the cause of the

⁸⁴ Francis Bacon, *Sylva Sylvarum; or a Naturall Historie* (London, 1626), 10.

⁸⁵ Catherine Lisak, "'Succession' versus 'Usurpation': Politics and Rhetoric in Shakespeare's *Richard II*" in *The Struggle for the Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. Jean-Christophe Mayer (Montpellier: Universite Paul-Valery, 2004), 358.

⁸⁶ See *OED* n.1 and 3 for these definitions.

country's political instability cannot also be its cure. This said, the taciturn statesman whom Richard mockingly called the "silent King" (*R2* 4.1.290) has acquired a powerful eloquence in office, with which he now promotes the crusade he had promised in the final lines of *Richard II* in order to exculpate his guilt over Richard's death: "No more the thirsty entrance of this soil / Shall daub her [England's] lips with her own children's blood" (*IH4* 1.1.5-9). With a paternal care for his people that he has perhaps never shown his son, Henry portrays the crusade as a means of ensuring peace and stability at home: "Those opposed eyes [...] Shall now in mutual well-beseeming ranks / March all one way" (*IH4* 1.1.9-15). Although Holinshed records Henry's intentions to journey to the Holy Land (3.540/2/65), Henry's rationale encapsulates the increasingly vociferous arguments of Essex's war party to capitalize on their Cadiz success and reengage Spanish land forces on the continent. "For Essex and many others who shared his views," writes Hammer, "the war against Spain was a crusade which involved religion and a sense of national destiny."⁸⁷ In "An Apologie of the Earle of Essex," a leaked private letter to Anthony Bacon, dated 1600 yet probably written in 1598,⁸⁸ which disingenuously promotes the thesis "that peace is to be preferred before warre," Essex describes Portugal, against whom he fought in 1589, as a "generall enemy to the libertie of Christendome" and Henry of Navarre, with whom he fought at Rouen in 1592, as "the most redoubted Captaine of all Christendome." To the increasingly militant Protestants who viewed

⁸⁷ Hammer, *Polarization of Elizabethan Politics* 393.

⁸⁸ Cautioning against Spain's false embassies and treaties, Essex writes, perhaps with Chapman's Homeric translation in mind, "their first maine attempt against *England*, was in 88. from that time to this present is full tenne yeares, the just time of the siege of *Troy*"; see "An Apologie of the Earle of Essex," Huntington Library, EEBO.

Essex as their spiritual leader, the modern crusade had been directed away from the Ottoman Empire and toward Catholic Spain and her European allies.

Henry's anticipation of "new broils / To be commenced in strands afar remote [to] chase these pagans in those holy fields" (*IH4* 1.1.3-24) suggests the influence upon Shakespeare of Daniel, who was something of a literary spokesman for the Essex circle at that time. In Book Two of *The Civil Wars*, in stanzas that explicitly connect Henry to Essex, Daniel bundles the "proud *Iberus* Lord" and "th'earth's terror *Ottoman*" into "*the Easterne Powres*" that Essex might conquer in "*Elizas* name" (*CW* 2.123-27). Any notion that Shakespeare intended to fashion a simplistic, and perilous, analogy between the two Herefords, Henry and Essex, is soon challenged, however, by the first scene's shift from martial to familial dynastic concerns. Hearing reports of Hotspur's heroism, Henry admits to paternal envy of Northumberland:

O, that it could be proved
That some night-tripping fairy had exchanged
In cradle clothes our children where they lay,
And called mine 'Percy', his 'Plantagenet';
Then would I have his Harry, and he mine.
(*IH4* 1.1.85-89)

Drawing once again on Daniel, who makes Hal and Hotspur contemporaries (*CW* 4:34-48) and therefore self-reflective, Shakespeare initiates the trope of surreptitious displacement that recurs throughout *I Henry IV*, especially with regard to the play's three Harrys. Henry's bitter wish to embrace a changeling child in place of his wastrel son, while it underscores the dangerous interchangeability of pretender and Prince in a disrupted hereditary hegemony, also anticipates the transference of the evanescent Henry-

Essex analogy as it prepares to migrate from father to son and then from son to rival-son during the following two scenes.

Only a year earlier, Shakespeare's audience had witnessed the unseemly spectacle of two royal fairies wrestling over another changeling child, "A lovely boy stol'n from an Indian king" (*MND* 2.1.22). In this cosmic battle for child custody, Oberon, writes Louis Montrose in a reading of *Midsommer* that "neutralize[s] gendered forms of [matriarchal] royal power to which [the play] ostensibly pays homage," must extract the boy "from an indulgent and infantilizing" Titania so that he can "transition from the woman-centered world of his early childhood to the man-centered world of his youth."⁸⁹ 1.2 of *I Henry IV* instigates another quasi-familial relationship in which the youth must in time break free from an unhealthy parental figure. As I have already noted, the Q1 of *I Henry IV* indicates Shakespeare's prior intention to confer on Falstaff and his cronies characteristics of the faction opposing Essex, and Hal's early reference to Jack as "my old lad of the castle" (*IH4* 1.2.40), alluding to Cobham's ancestor John Oldcastle, somehow survived the 1600 censorship. Oldcastle did indeed turn traitor to Henry V in the way Falstaff jokingly anticipates (1.2.138-39), while Falstaff's characterization of his gang as "squires of the night's body [...] Diana's foresters, gentlemen of the shade, minions of the moon," and then, ironically, "men of good government" to their "noble and chaste mistress, the moon" [i.e., Queen Elizabeth] (1.2.22-29), seems to resuscitate the School of Night symbolism surrounding Raleigh half a decade earlier.

⁸⁹ Louis Montrose, *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theater* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1996), 203 and 134-35.

Yet Shakespeare “shuffles” amid these layers of factional sleights glances at his own faction head and at the intimate, fraught relationship between Elizabeth and Essex. The crude, bawdy exchanges between Hal and Falstaff, which allegedly delighted the Queen as much as her subjects, address common critiques of Essex’s manipulation of royal indulgence, at both the sexual and financial level. Essex, who inherited his father’s massive debts, was spectacularly successful at wringing gifts and grants from Elizabeth: according to Lawrence Stone, the young Earl received almost half of the wealth she distributed in her final years.⁹⁰ Of course, such bounty comes at a cost; recompensing his services and expenditures, Elizabeth also bought Essex’s public adoration, loyalty, and presence. In a parody of this fiscal-emotional interdependency, Hal borrows against his royal credit to cover Falstaff’s brothel bills (1.2.52) in return for playing the highwayman, the “madcap” (1.2.135), and the womanizer. “Why, what have I to do with my hostess of the tavern?” Hal protests, to which Falstaff replies, “Well, thou hast called her to a reckoning many a time and oft” (1.2.45-48). Essex, whose reputation as a philanderer was legendary, had married Mary Sidney in secret, fathered a number of illegitimate children, and seemed to treat Elizabeth’s ladies-in-waiting as his personal harem. While Hal and Falstaff wrangled on stage over their brothel bill, offstage rumors circulated of an affair between Essex and the Countess of Derby, Mary Herbert’s close friend and Daniel’s future patron. Meanwhile in April 1597, according to Hammer, “Elizabeth Brydges and Elizabeth Russel had their ears boxed by the Queen for an

⁹⁰ Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy* (Oxford: OUP, 1965), 473. Although Hammer is suspicious of the magnitude of this fraction, he agrees that the Queen’s largesse to Essex was impressive; see *Polarization of Elizabethan Politics* 322.

assignation in the privy gardens which probably involved Essex.”⁹¹ Yet, despite there being more than one Elizabeth (or even two) in Essex’s life, the Queen, though she often sulked, indulged a man who was little more than half her age.

Half a century later, describing the close relationship between Elizabeth and his former master, Robert Naunton recalled “too [sic] notable quotations”:

The first was a violent indulgency of the Queen (which incident to old age, where it encounters with a pleasing and sutable object) towards this Lord, all which argues a none perpetuity, the second was a fault in the object of her grace; my Lord himselfe, who drew in too fast, like a child sucking on an over uberous Nurse, and had there been a more decent decorum observed in both, or either of these, without doubt, the unity of their affections, had been more permanent, and not so in and out, as they were, like an instrument ill tuned, and lapsing to discord.⁹²

Clearly, Elizabeth, playing the queasily sensual role of indulgent matriarch to a rapacious Essex, could be as comically unsettling as Falstaff offering his services as Hal’s paternal pimp (1.2.32-55) in exchange for what Naunton would call his “urbanity and innate curtesie.” “In this remarkable passage,” writes Frank Whigham, “the queen raging against the shriveling of post-maturity, is seen [...] as excessively, *violently* abundant, Essex as greedy (or starving?), their aggressively infantile kinship pathological at both poles.”⁹³ Calling Falstaff “a latter spring [and] All-hallowen summer” -- both terms for an Indian summer -- Hal likewise characterizes Falstaff as a beloved yet bloated old man clinging embarrassingly to his youth, or rather sucking youth from his young companion.

⁹¹ Hammer, *Polarization of Elizabethan Politics* 319, n.17.

⁹² Sir Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta regalia, or, Observations on the late Queen Elizabeth, her times and favorits* (London, 1641), 33.

⁹³ Frank Whigham, “Essex and the Uberous Mule,” unpublished, Shakespeare Association of America, 2012.

Hal's rationalization of his unruly behavior at the end of this episode recapitulates the self-reflective complexity and contingency of the first scene:

I know you all, and will awhile uphold
The unyoked humor of your idleness.
Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
To smother up his beauty from the world,
That, when he please again to be himself,
Being wanted, he may be more wondered at.
(*IH4* 1.2.185-91)

Foreshadowing Hamlet's familial dissatisfaction -- "I am too much i'th'sun" (*Ham* 1.2.67) -- Hal's aurally ambivalent claim to "imitate the *son*," which creates a friction between his dynastic duties and his kindred alliances, inflects Essex's increasing frustration at "having to attend upon an ageing queen";⁹⁴ this man-boy had, after all, earned his stripes at Zutphen at nineteen years of age. Reacting to the Queen's suffocating intimacy, Essex was notorious for retreating to his chambers or, pleading illness, quitting the court altogether. Hal's justification for "holidaying" at the Boar's Head, which is like a distended version of Essex's "ranginge abroad,"⁹⁵ possesses a Machiavellian theatricality that is as unnerving as it is impressive. Staging his own dereliction and manipulating his popular appeal are precursors, so Hal claims, to a resplendent return to favor. In the play's only verse soliloquy, Hal reveals himself to his audience (rather than betraying himself to his comrades) as a politic performer, a player-prince like Hamlet; and much like Essex, who once wrote: "I must like the watermen

⁹⁴ Hammer, *Polarization of Elizabethan Politics*, 87.

⁹⁵ Lambeth Palace Library, London (hence LPL), MS 649, fol. 378^r, cited in Hammer, *Polarization of Elizabethan Politics*, 319.

rowe one way and look an other.”⁹⁶ Of course, as Greenblatt has brilliantly espoused, the coming men of early modern England were all busily refashioning themselves; but Essex, as we shall shortly see, took the *topos* of the player-prince to another level. Not content with leaving a vestigial Essex in Hal’s accommodating figure, however, I suggest that Shakespeare has one more character for him to infiltrate.

In the final scene of Act One, filling out and completing his transpositional analogical process, Shakespeare engineers Essex’s third migration. Scholars have long noted parallels between Shakespeare’s Hotspur and Essex, which both celebrate and critique Essex’s martial reputation. On the up side, writes James Bulman, Hotspur “embodies all that is glorious about feudal chivalry” -- the codes of honor, the achievement in arms, the empowerment of self and family over state – “which had to be tamed by a centralizing authority.”⁹⁷ In *2 Henry IV*, Lady Percy’s paeon to her dead husband as “the glass / Wherein the noble youth did dress themselves” (2*H4* 2.3.20-21) reflects the resplendent image of Essex in his square-cut Cadiz beard, “which for a time was affected by young Benedicks who wished to be in the mode.”⁹⁸ Although in *Henry V* the fashionable beard had lost its luster to ubiquity, Gower, by mocking the upstart soldier with “his beard of the General’s cut,” clearly intends Essex to be among the “great commanders” whose names the *miles gloriosus* must “learn by rote” (*H5* 3.6.69-76). On the downside, Hotspur is rash, impetuous, fiery, and moody. “Why dost thou bend thine

⁹⁶ Letter to Edward Reynoldes, July 28 1596, LPL, 658, fol. 136r; cited in Hammer, “‘The Smiling Crocodile:’ The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan ‘Popularity,’” in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, edited by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007.98.

⁹⁷ *Henry IV, Parts 1 and 2*, ed. James C. Bulman, *The Norton Shakespeare* (New York: Norton, 2003), 156.

⁹⁸ Harrison 130.

eyes upon the earth, / And start so often when thou sit'st alone?" (*IH4* 2.3.43-44), asks Lady Percy in response to the kind of volatility that continued to perplex Essex's erstwhile Secretary Sir Henry Wotton forty-five years after Essex's execution: "Yet still I know not how, like a gathering of Clouds his humours grew Tart, as being now in the Lees of favour; it brake forth into certayne suddaine recesses."⁹⁹

While potential associations, however evanescent, between Essex and the rebellious Hotspur cast dangerous shadows, Charles Fish notes key Shakespearean alterations from Holinshed that would render the parallel less disturbing to an Essexian sensibility.¹⁰⁰ Rather than Hotspur, Worcester and Northumberland are chief among the "crafty" plotters, and their conspiracy with Mortimer -- Richard's nominated heir and Hotspur's brother-in-law -- is presented as a *fait accompli*. Moreover, by having Henry quit the scene before Hotspur learns of Mortimer's claim to the throne, (1.3.154-57), Shakespeare avoids the unequivocal challenge dramatized in Holinshed: "Behold, the heire of the relme is robbed of his right, and yet the robber with his owne will not redeeme him" (3.520/2/40). Fish's contention, that Shakespeare, in heaping blame upon Worcester and Northumberland, paints a more honorable portrait of Henry than Holinshed, applies equally to Hotspur.¹⁰¹ By massaging events to keep the King and the pretender apart, Shakespeare not only postpones the dramatic conflict between Hal and Hotspur on the field of battle, he also encourages the audience's empathy for Hotspur's thoroughly Essexian outrage: "I will lift the down-trod Mortimer / As high in the air as

⁹⁹ Sir Henry Wotton, *A parallel betweene Robert late Earle of Essex, and George late Duke of Buckingham* (London, 1641), EEBO, 1641-1700.

¹⁰⁰ Charles Fish, "Henry IV, Shakespeare and Holinshed," *Studies in Philology* 61.2 (1964), 205-18.

¹⁰¹ Fish 209.

this unthankful King” (1.3.133-34). It could be said that Shakespeare shapes the historical record in order to dignify Henry and Hotspur, the former *and* the future rebel.

In consecutive scenes, then, I suggest that Shakespeare infuses three dramatically oppositional figures with distinctive Essexian characteristics: Henry’s political ambitions converge with Essex’s foreign policy pronouncements; Hal’s conflicted relationship to the throne echoes Essex’s fraught relations with his Queen; Hotspur’s outraged honor enacts the feudal code that Essex embodies and his supporters advocate. Shakespeare’s refractive analogical technique seems designed, at least on one level, to encourage partisan slogans: in this parallel Plantagenet universe, there is a little touch of Essex in everyone; Essex is not a part of the political process, he *is* the political process. I want to suggest, further, that the striking resemblances between the allusive tactics in *1 Henry IV* and Essex and Bacon’s *Masque of Love and Self-Love*, composed a year earlier than the play, not only substantiates Hammer’s perception that, after Cadiz, Essex launched a “multi-media campaign” to promote his aggressive war policies and enlarge his role on the Privy Council under the newly elected Secretary Cecil,¹⁰² but also suggests that Shakespeare was a key literary contributor to the campaign.

Co-written by Francis Bacon and Essex (in a conspicuous role as dramatist and theatrical producer),¹⁰³ *The Masque Of Love and Self-Love* was performed at great

¹⁰² Hammer, "The Smiling Crocodile" 103.

¹⁰³ Who wrote how much of the masque depends on a scholar’s loyalties: for Bacon, see Brian Vickers, *Francis Bacon: Major Works* (Oxford: OUP, 2002), 536-37; for Essex and his secretaries, see Hammer, "Upstaging the queen: the earl of Essex, Francis Bacon and the Accession Day celebrations of 1595," in *The politics of the Stuart Court masque* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), 41-66.

expense before the Queen at the Accession Day tilts on 17 November 1595.¹⁰⁴ An outer plot, in which Erophilus (an obvious allegory of Essex) informs the Queen of his temptation by three messengers to serve Philautia, or Self-Love, survives only in fragments. Yet when it comes to texts of the inner plot, which, it should be noted, does not feature the Queen, “there is,” in Hammer’s words, “something of an embarrassment of riches.”¹⁰⁵ In this scenario, the messengers -- a “Wandering Hermit, storming Soldier, and hollow Statesman” -- champion their own professions by rhetorically challenging each other’s: “Contemplation is a dream, love a trance, and the humor of war is raving,” vaunts the Statesman. However, Erophilus’ arbitrating Squire (clearly Bacon) concludes that his master need not choose between disciplines nor determine which will gain the most reward: “may not my master enjoy his own felicity, and have all yours for advantage? I do not mean that he should divide himself [...] because all these are in the hands of his mistress [...] knowledge, fame, and fortune.” By refusing to “forsake the Queen,” Erophilus/Essex reaffirms his royal devotion while simultaneously enlarging himself; for learning, war, and politics are precisely those qualities associated with Essex in the public imagination. By reaffirming his mastery of all three disciplines for his Queen rather than for his own ambition, Essex turns self-sacrifice into self-adulation.

An upstaged Elizabeth, seemingly aware that her representative role in the play’s minor outer plot had merely supported Essex in his many featured roles in the inner plot, abruptly halted the performance, remarking with pointed irony that, “if she had thought

¹⁰⁴ Sir Roland Whyte’s letter to Sir Robert Sidney of November 22 1595, which offers a detailed eyewitness account of the theatrical event, is partly transcribed in Vickers 535-36.

¹⁰⁵ Hammer, “Upstaging the Queen” 46.

there had been so much of her, she would not have been there that night,” and, according to an anonymous spectator, “so went to bed.”¹⁰⁶ Undeterred, perhaps even delighted, Essex’s publicity machine went into overdrive, turning a diplomatic *faux pas* into a public relations *coup*: his “darling piece” (as Wotton would remember it years later)¹⁰⁷ was reproduced in various forms and, along with a Hilliard miniature of Essex in tournament gear and several ‘instant ballads’ commemorating the event, was circulated widely. Whether Shakespeare was encouraged to replicate its rhetorical tactics on the public stage or was simply intrigued by the central conceit of a scribal copy, *The Masque of Love and Self-Love* seemed to offer him a means of portraying Essex through a clarifying perspective -- though not, I suggest, a magnifying glass. While Shakespeare had neither the political clout nor, presumably, the artistic servility to promote Essex’s Bottom-like political fantasy, in which he plays all the parts,¹⁰⁸ *I Henry IV* builds on the masque’s crass self-promotion to explore the interrogative, the didactic, and the evasive possibilities of analogical refraction within the history play.

By distributing various aspects of the Essex persona among competing dramatic figures, Shakespeare’s analogy is impossible to pin down. As in a hall of mirrors, his reflection appears and reappears in various shapes and guises from one scene to the next, inhabiting characters that, in various ways, contradict the biographical Essex. Unlike Hal, for instance, Essex was never a wastrel; if anything, writes Hammer, he overprized his “aristocratic virtue and his “belief that he had a godly ‘calling’ to live a public life for the

¹⁰⁶ Quoted in Vickers 536.

¹⁰⁷ Wotton, *Parallel*, 8.

¹⁰⁸ I refer here to “Bottom’s Dream [that] hath no bottom,” in which he is elevated to King of the Fairies, and to his unbounded theatrical egotism: “Let me play the lion too” (*MND* 4.2.208-9 and 1.2.58).

benefit of the state,”¹⁰⁹ and the pressure of living under a perpetual spotlight imposed a terrible, even fatal, burden. Essex never possessed Henry’s royal authority, and never claimed it; rather, his negotiations with James in Scotland from 1595 onwards characterize him as a kingmaker, another Warwick, rather than as a Duke of York or Henry Bolingbroke. And he would never subject his Welsh powerbase --where he was raised, kept extensive estates, and sought support during the rebellion -- to Hotspur’s mockery of Glendower and his Welsh language: “Now I perceive the devil understands Welsh, / And ‘tis no marvel he is so humerous” (*IH4* 3.2.226-27). Divided among his many selves, Shakespeare’s Essex evades capture so effectively that *I Henry IV*’s Q1 text, unlike that of *2 Henry IV*, which was published at the same time, suffered only the minor alteration of Falstaff’s name as part of the Oldcastle/Brook controversy. As Clare contends, the relatively petty “Brooke-baiting” issue was probably designed to “excite the interest of the initiated spectator [to] decode [...] apparently forbidden things.”¹¹⁰

Attempting to decode these “forbidden things,” I suggest that Shakespeare trifurcates the Earl’s persona within the play’s three Henrys not only to hide him from the censor’s gaze, but also to explore certain aspects of the Essex “megalopsyche.” Instead of isolating Essex’s talents in their discrete bodies to be individually admired under the public gaze, as in *The Masque of Love and Self-Love*, Shakespeare lets his Essexian avatars collide, their impact sending analogical identifications shimmering -- or shivering -- across the surface of the dialogue. In 3.2, for instance, when Henry and his recalcitrant son finally meet, their recriminations echo with Essexian outrage. When Hal bemoans the

¹⁰⁹ Hammer, “The Smiling Crocodile” 100.

¹¹⁰ Clare, *Tongue tied by authority*” 19.

“smiling pickthanks and base newsmongers,” (3.2.25) who poison his reputation at court, he recasts Henry as Elizabeth, who submitted to “Cobham the Sycophant’s” frequent belittling of Essex.¹¹¹ When Henry complains of Richard “Mingl[ing] his royalty with cap’ring fools” (63), he echoes Essex’s grievances over Elizabeth’s policy of favoritism at court: both, in a sense, become the rebellious child pushing against an overbearing parental figure. “Shakespearean representations of high-level politics,” writes Mallin of James’s various embodiments in *Hamlet*, “repeatedly deploy multiple vessels for the portrayal of single [...] historical subjects, and these vessels are often, and justly so within the logic of the plot, *antithetical* forces.”¹¹²

However oppositional they might seem, of course, Henry and Hal are anything but antithetical. When they square off, father and son peer into a hereditary mirror that reflects “the shadow of succession” (*IH4* 3.2.99) in multiplying, retreating prisms. Debora Shuger notes that the Renaissance mirror rarely offers an exact reflection. Rather, “the self’s internal mirror angles outward, [...] permitting only an oblique glimpse.” What the viewer sees instead “are saints, skulls, friends, offspring, spouses, magistrates, Christ. The mirror reflects these figures because they are images of oneself.”¹¹³ What Henry and Hal reflect onto and within each other are canted images of the illegitimate ruler “enfeoffed [...] to popularity” (3.2.69). They mimic each other in language that expresses the performer’s self-awareness and the politician’s calculation. Henry’s recollection -- “being seldom seen [...] I was more wondered at” (3.2.46-47) -- almost

¹¹¹ Wotton 9.

¹¹² Mallin, *Inscribing the Time* 151.

¹¹³ Debora Shuger, “The ‘I’ of the Beholder: Renaissance Mirrors and the Reflexive Mind,” in *Renaissance Culture and the Everyday*, ed. Patricia Fumerton and Simon Hunt (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1999), 37.

exactly echoes Hal's earlier expectation: "Being wanted, I may be more wondered at" (1.2.196). Henry derides Hal's "courtship of the common people" in exactly the way Richard II had once derided him: 'How he [Bolingbroke] did seem to dive into their hearts / With humble and familiar courtesy" (R2 1.4.24-26). Henry's denying of his own prior populism merely underscores his persistent guilt, and his recycled accusations against his heir threaten to create what William Blackstone once called "a kind of hereditary right of usurpation."¹¹⁴

We should recognize in these accusations of seeming and populism bandied between father and son the elements Everard Guilpin borrowed directly from Shakespeare in order to mock Essex as "signor Machiavel" in his verse satire *Skialetheia, Or a Shadow of Truth* (1598).¹¹⁵ And Guilpin was not the only one to transpose Essex onto these familial reflections.¹¹⁶ A commonplace book of metaphysical and theological notes attributed to Thomas Harriot, core member of Raleigh's School of Night, came to light only some twenty years ago.¹¹⁷ The body of the book contains sixty pages of scientific observations; a reference to Queen Elizabeth in the present tense indicates that these notes were made before March 1603. On its back flyleaves, in what looks like the

¹¹⁴ William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 1765-6, quoted in Lisak 355.

¹¹⁵ Everard Guilpin, Satire 1 in *Skialetheia, or a Shadow of Truth, in Certaine Epigrams and Satyres*, ed. D Allen Carroll (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1991), 59-61. See also my Hayward chapter, 24-25.

¹¹⁶ Hilton Kelliher, "Contemporary Manuscript Extracts from Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part 1*," in *English Manuscript Studies: 1100-1700*, ed. Peter Beal and Jeremy Griffiths (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989).

¹¹⁷ For a full analysis of the "Harriot notes," see Hilton Kelliher, "Contemporary Manuscript Extracts from Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part 1*" in *English Manuscript Studies: 1100-1700*, ed. Peter Beal and Jeremy Griffiths, Vol. 1 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 144-81.

same scribal hand, are sixty-three lines from the first four acts of *I Henry IV*. Appearing to have been written at speed during performance and corrected from memory, they include a preponderance of speeches from Henry and Hotspur, the longest of which copies the same twelve lines from the King's lecture to Hal (3.2.39-57) that Guilpin used to satirize Essex. Expounding the value of political performance, Henry begins with a critique of Richard:

Had I so lavish of my presence been,
So common-hackneyed in the eyes of men,
So stale and chap to vulgar company,
Opinion, that did help me to the crown,
Had still kept loyal to possession.

Revealing a heightened sense -- an actor's awareness, even -- of self-presentation, Henry then explains the public relations value of controlled release, of stage-managed mystique:

By being seldom seen, I could not stir,
But, like a comet, I was wondered at,
That men would tell their children, 'This is he!'
Others would say, 'Where? Which is Bolingbroke?'
And then I stole all courtesy from heaven
And dressed myself in such humility
That I did pluck allegiance from men's hearts.
Loud shouts and salutations from their mouths,
Even in the presence of the crowned King.
(*IHIV* 3.2.39-54)

The copyist, however, introduces a striking variant into this extract, rewriting "Even in the presence of the crowned King" as "even in / the presence of y^e Queene w^{ch} els."

Considering the writer's pains to reproduce Shakespeare accurately elsewhere, this revision seems to be less an unconscious slip than a conscious decryption that places advice on how to court and control public favor -- even in the face of one's monarch -- at the heart of the political moment. Whether the copyist was Harriot or an acquaintance of

his, this document suggests that someone in the opposing faction was mining Shakespeare's text *in performance* for Essexian "secret drifts," and those drifts concerned the politics of playing.

In the previous chapter, I noted the shared concerns of Hayward, Shakespeare, Daniel, and Francis Bacon regarding the way in which Essex, by courting the people, interposed himself between the monarch and her subjects, making them his audience -- as he did most conspicuously during *The Masque of Love and Self-Love*. Unsurprisingly, Shakespeare had long equated statecraft with stagecraft. In his first tetralogy, casting his playwright's eye over the role performance plays in politics, Shakespeare barely disguised his admiration of the skill with which Richard Gloucester, like his father before him (2*H6* 1.2.238-50), outplays his credulous rivals: "I can add colours to the chameleon, / Change shapes with Proteus for advantages, / And set the murderous Machiavel to school" (2*H6* 3.2.191-93). During his earlier factional associations, when Essex was a glittering "leading light in the court's 'rat pack' of young aristocrats,"¹¹⁸ Shakespeare reserved his critiques for the histrionics of oppositional or obstructive figures, such as Raleigh's "Monarcho" Armado, who "makes sport to the Prince" (*LLL* 4.1.97-98), and for the monarchs of spectacle, Richard and Queen Elizabeth. Recruited, as I hypothesize, to contribute to the publicity drive of an Earl whose ambition was likened to that of a guileful crocodile -- Spenser's "cruell craftie [beast] / Which in false grieve hyding his harmefull guile, / Sheddeth tender teares"¹¹⁹ -- Shakespeare, rather than formulating

¹¹⁸ Hammer, *Polarization of Politics* 95.

¹¹⁹ Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene* (London: Penguin, 1987), 1:v.18, 5-7. In court, Serjeant Christopher Yelverton likened Essex's ambition to a "Crocodile that is said to grow soe long as it liveth"; cited in Hammer, "The Smiling Crocodile" 105.

stock propaganda, emulated the didactic humanism of fellow factional authors in order to offer an instructive interrogation of Essex's dangerously dispersed political persona.

Falstaff is the most natural actor to grace the stage of *I Henry IV*; "always in motion, always adopting postures, assuming characters," writes C.L. Barber, he thrills us with his theatrical gymnastics and his promise of Saturnalian release.¹²⁰ But where Falstaff inhabits his characters, Hal hides behind his. Skillful in mimicry and impressively versatile -- in the "mock" deposition scene when he cedes the "throne" to Falstaff (in performance, often placing a cushion on his head), Hal apes Falstaff, Henry, Hotspur, Glendower, and Douglas (*IH4* 2.4.318-467) -- he is nonetheless a gifted amateur who acts by design rather than by vocation. If his soliloquy in 1.2 is somewhat cold-blooded, his behavior following the robbery at Gad's Hill, when he is belligerently drunk and determinedly not himself, is positively disturbing: "call in Falstaff, I'll play Percy, and that damned brawn shall play Dame Mortimer his wife. 'Rivo' says the drunkard!" (2.4.107-9). Reluctant to "pay the debt [of duty he] never promised" (1.2.199), yet painfully aware that he is a cuckoo in Mistress Quickly's nest, Hal struggles to find his role. Beneath his reckless exterior reside traces of his cousin Richard's earlier anxiety: "Thus play I in one person many people, / And none contented" (*R2* 5.5.31-32). In the first three acts of *I Henry IV*, Hal leaves unanswered the question of who he is and what he might be running from; while he has much to lose in repudiating his old "fool and jester" (*2H4* 5.5.48), he has even more to gain in recovering himself.

¹²⁰ For the play's celebration of carnival, see C.L. Barber, "Rule and Misrule in 'Henry IV,'" in *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1959, 192-220.

Yet in the very exchange with his father that initiates the process of self-revelation -- “I shall hereafter, my thrice-gracious lord / Be more myself” (*IH4* 3.2.93-94) -- Hal learns, as do we, that performance runs in the family. In the previous play, the banished Bolingbroke’s taciturnity, especially in contrast with Richard’s rhetorical virtuosity, seems to speak to an arid imagination. Dismissing John of Gaunt’s attempts to mitigate his son’s ten-year banishment by envisioning it as a holiday rather than an exile, Bolingbroke prosaically replies: “O, who can hold a fire in his hand / By thinking on the frosty Caucasus?” (*R2* 1.3.294-95). To his own son, however, Henry reveals that his silence is a form of staged eloquence, just as his humility is a style of costume and his presence a rare promise: as a young pretender, the lead actor camouflaged himself in a supporting role with few lines. Henry’s disclosure is both impressive and deceptive, validating as something more than jealousy Richard’s recollection of his staged exile: “How he did seem to dive into [the common people’s] hearts / With humble and familiar courtesy” (*R2* 1.4.25-26). This passage, with its reference to Henry vaying “his bonnet to an oyster-wench” (*R2* 1.4.31), develops the trope with which Daniel and Guilpin interrogate Essex’s populism. Henry’s subsequent parental advice certainly lends credence to Hotspur’s characterization of his King as a “vile politician” (*IH4* 1.3.241) whose developed sense of *realpolitik* is enacted through performance.

Shakespeare never condemns acting *per se*; to do so would be rather self-defeating. Perhaps it is Hotspur’s very inadequacy as an actor that kills him: incapable of following Worcester’s script, or “secret book” (*IH4* 1.3.187), Hotspur speaks over others’ lines (“Peace, cousin, say no more” [1.3.186]); he improvises, or “apprehends a world of figures” (1.3.208) far beyond the scope of the plot; he mislays his props (“A

plague upon it, I have forgot the map!” [3.1.4-5]); he disdains “mincing poetry” and music (3.1.126-31; 232-32); he cannot even finish all his lines: “No, Percy, thou art dust / And food for -- ” (5.4.84-85). A smart actor like Henry listens for cues; Hotspur talks himself into his grave. Impersonation in *I Henry IV* can be both beneficial and sacrificial: facing Douglas on the field at Tewkesbury, Blount counterfeits Henry’s life and loses his own, while Falstaff saves his life by counterfeiting his own death. Discretion, it would seem, is the better part of valor *and* of acting (5.4.117). Choose your roles carefully, Shakespeare suggests, and play them well. And herein lies the crisis for Henry, for the usurper is always dressed in borrowed robes. From the moment he returns from exile to his final speech, Henry has played at being king while battling relentlessly to prove his just title, his performance written into the locution of the perpetual pretender: “For all my reign hath been but as a scene / Acting that argument (*2H4* 4.5.197-98). It will take Hal a second play to fully “turn away [his] former self” (*2H4* 5.5.58), and yet another until the “new and gorgeous garment, majesty [...] sits easy on [him]” (5.2.44-45). Yet at least Henry dies knowing that, whatever challenges his son still faces, Henry V is a role Hal was born to play.

However much, if at all, Shakespeare intended *I Henry IV* to reflect anxieties within the more moderate orbit of the Essex circle over Southampton and Henry Cuffe’s increasingly aggressive and proactive ambitions for Essex, it is striking how closely the play’s concerns and counsel align with Bacon’s. Attempting to reconcile a disgruntled Essex and his wary Queen in the aftermath of Cadiz, Bacon, in late 1596, crafted a letter of bold advice to his master. In densely metatheatrical language, he writes that to “win the Queen” Essex should adopt “particulars afoot” only to “let them fall”; to “make a

pretence of some journeys,” which he “mought relinquish”; to “pretend to be as bookish [...] as ever” while pursuing his military interests; to “speak against popularity [yet] go on in [his] honourable commonwealth courses”; even to “give way to some other favorite.”¹²¹ Although Edwin Abbot, Essex’s Victorian biographer, was shocked by “the trickiness which breathes through every precept” in Bacon’s letter,¹²² Essex would have done well to adopt the roles suggested for him. Hammer, usually skeptical of authorial influence, concedes: “Shakespeare’s play actually echoes discussion among the earl’s own inner circle [...] about the need to be more subtle in his courting of public acclaim lest the queen come to see him as a political threat.”¹²³

Shakespeare’s refractive technique in *I Henry IV* also seems, however, to offer a subtle critique of Bacon’s rhetorical and political tactics in *The Masque of Love and Self-Love*. While the *Masque*’s Squire judges the Statesman’s life “nothing but a continual acting upon a stage,”¹²⁴ Bacon’s drama, like his later letter to Essex, betrays not a shred of anxiety about how many roles Essex can play at one time or for how long, nor the damage they might inflict upon the performer. Bacon’s discrete Essex figurines, intended to represent a *gestalt* icon, a magnificent portrait greater even than the sum of its many parts, ultimately make for bad drama and crass propaganda. In stark contrast, Shakespeare’s fleeting images confront and interrogate one another in a kaleidoscope that is both self-complicating and potentially self-destructive. On the one hand, Essex’s

¹²¹ Spedding 9:40-45.

¹²² Edwin A. Abbott, *Francis Bacon: An Account of His Life and Works* (London: Macmillan, 1855), 85.

¹²³ Hammer, “Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising,” 23. Worden, another doubter of Shakespeare’s political affiliations, yields to the same conclusion in “Shakespeare in Life and Art” 36.

¹²⁴ Vickers 67.

absorption into the three separate roles of usurper-King, successor-Prince, and pretender-Earl create an impressive composite picture of Essex's political status in the late sixteenth century. Yet everywhere he looked Essex also confronted himself in broken reflections of the Renaissance ruler, a triptych of dangerously competing energies within an unstable ruling body. In this sense, Essex is not so much a part of Henry, Hal, and Hotspur as they are parts of him, and their distinctive selves -- the warrior, the politician, the player -- represent both the complex essences of the modern ruler and the critical need to harmonize qualities, or politic humors, that in contention might destroy one another. In *I Henry IV*, Shakespeare's refracted portraits of Essex compound to form a dramatically compelling, if politically troubling, image of a dissident aristocrat, a perpetually unknowable, almost schizophrenic, recklessly ambitious pretender. Echoing and multiplying Elizabeth's identification of herself with Richard II, Essex might well have boasted (or complained): "I am Henry, Hal, Hotspur. Know ye not that?"

Hewing to the humanist didacticism of Daniel's *Civil Wars* and Hayward's prose history, Shakespeare offers a provocative yet, I think, ultimately constructive critique of the Essex faction's public relations process. For, although *I Henry IV* offers an alarming myriad of Essexian reflections, the text also encodes Shakespeare's long-term strategy of collapsing three Harrys into a single, more or less stable, imago of the modern ruler:

Henry V.¹²⁵ "I shall hereafter, my thrice-gracious lord, / Be more myself" (*IH4* 3.2.93-94), Hal reassures an aging Henry; while Hotspur's assertion that, "the hour is come / To

¹²⁵ In his seminal essay, "Rabbits, Ducks, 'Henry V'," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 28.3 (1977), Norman Rabkin posits that the play's "ultimate power" lies in Shakespeare's portrayal of a King who "points in opposite directions" demanding concurrent yet antithetical responses from the audience -- adoration of a Christian King or revulsion for a "Machiavellian militarist," 279-80.

end the one of us” (3.2.67-68), unwittingly acknowledges that his own death will ultimately make “Harry, like himself” (*Henry V* C.1.0.5). By the end of 2 *Henry IV*, three Henry’s have indeed become one. Yet this critical process of reification, by reassembling the shards into a legible analogy of Henry-Essex, also deconstructs Shakespeare’s rhetorical tactics, rendering his oblique allusions and factional affiliations much more transparent than he originally made them. In 2 *Henry IV*, the widowed Lady Percy’s paean to Hotspur conjures a mirror image of Essex: “In military rules, humours of blood / He was the mark and glass, copy and book, / That fashioned others (2*H4* 2.3.21-32). Uncomplicated by counter reflections or alternating binaries, the entire passage succumbed to the censor in 1600, while the Hotspur of the former play survived intact. That the blatant reference to Essex at the culmination of *Henry V* was similarly expurgated seems to suggest that Shakespeare was articulating his support, making himself known. By extension, the *Richard II* commission eighteen months later might be read as the culmination of a long-term, politically motivated strategy of self-revelation, albeit one that ended in disaster and Shakespeare’s enduring disaffection with the posthumous Essex faction in particular and factionalism in general. In the final section I shall argue that Shakespeare’s revised 1601 *Hamlet*, by holding a mirror up to the politics of playing, reflects this thesis.

4. *Hamlet*: an afterthought

As noted earlier, the re-commissioned *Richard II* in many ways represents the epitome of retroactive sedition, an innocent text seized upon by dissident forces determined to exploit its acquired toxicity. Sensitive to the cautionary tale of over-heated

conflicts between early twentieth-century historicists bent on proving Shakespeare's protracted involvement in a conspiracy,¹²⁶ modern scholars, while acknowledging the unique value of a play that transcended "the confines of theatrical production to enter into real-life political drama," are skeptical of assigning authorial intention to the event.¹²⁷ Shakespeare and his fellow shareholders are viewed as either innocent by-standers subject to the demands of their patrons and the financial imperatives of their profession¹²⁸ or as walk-on players trapped in the endgame of a national power struggle.¹²⁹

While I do not propose to challenge these notions entirely, I will argue that, considering Shakespeare's commitment to the Essex faction and his long-term allusive strategies, the *Richard II* commission was part of the faction's ongoing promotional

¹²⁶ I refer to an acrimonious exchange between Evelyn Albright and Ray Heffner played out in *PMLA* between 1913 and 1932 concerning Albright's anachronistic contention that *Richard II* was based on *Henrie VIII*.

¹²⁷ In "A New History for Shakespeare and His Time," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (1988), 441-64, Leeds Barroll indicates that he shares Worden and Hammer's doubts about Shakespeare's political engagement, conferring Hayward's prose history with greater seditious agency, and even positing that Coke supposed the play a dramatization of the book. Only Chris Fitter, in "Historicizing *Richard II*: Current Events, Dating, and the Sabotage of Essex," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 11.2 (2005), perceives the performance as a conscious political response, though he offers an oppositional reading of *Richard II* as an "injurious representation of Essex [that] married Shakespeare's skeptical political vision and aggrieved humanitarian sympathies to an urgent professional expedience," 46.

¹²⁸ In seeking to explain the commission, new historicists tend to follow the money. "Someone on the eve of rebellion, thought [*Richard II*] sufficiently seditious to warrant squandering two pounds on the players," writes Greenblatt, "and the Queen considered the performance a threat"; see *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance* (Norman, OK: Pilgrim Books, 1982), 4. M.D. Jardine suggests that New Historicists also envisage the all-pervasive patronage system as a "nightmare vision of Foucauldian carceration"; "New Historicism for Old: New Conservatism for Old?: The Politics of Patronage in the Renaissance," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991).

¹²⁹ Bate favors the hypothesis that the "Shakespeare performance commissioned by Percy [et al] played into [the] hands" of Essex's judges (250), who, for the past six months, had been trying desperately to tie Essex to Hayward's history as part of a broader conspiracy.

strategy. After all, enacting its politic historiography, *Richard II* recycles its own “lively pattern” of events in order to offer, in Jean Bodin’s phrase, “reliable maxims for what we should seek and avoid”:¹³⁰ replaying dramatic history is, in this sense, an acutely Tacitean gesture. If, as Hammer persuasively argues, an Essex faction, pushed to the limits of its endurance, was planning an “aristocratic intervention” against Elizabeth’s ministers at some point within the following week, then the play’s “first three acts [...] might plausibly be assimilated to the recent travails and future hopes of Essex and his friends, [while] the last two acts show things going horribly wrong.” Hammer concludes: “one message intended by this performance was surely that Essex -- unlike his ancestor Bolingbroke in 1399 -- would do it *properly*.”¹³¹ While Hammer largely absents the history players from his analysis, however, certain last-minute additions and revisions to *Hamlet*’s text, written during the tumultuous events of the uprising, suggest that Shakespeare’s conception of, and engagement with, the commission was pronounced and personal. Interpreting these revisions, I offer an alternative exegesis -- one, as it were, from the author’s pen-- of the purposes behind the replaying of *Richard II*.

To appreciate the striking parallels between Shakespeare’s dramatic narrative and the factional drama unfolding in his playhouse, we should take a moment to rehearse the pertinent facts of the episode. By February 1601, having endured two hearings into his conduct, a protracted period of house arrest, the Queen’s refusal to renew his farm of the custom on imported sweet wines (which effectively bankrupted him), and increasing

¹³⁰ Jean. Bodin, *A Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, trans. Beatrice Reynolds (New York: Columbia UP), 9.

¹³¹ Hammer, "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising," 33-34.

rumors of an alliance with the Spanish Infanta, Essex, despite suffering crippling depression, wrote to James VI of his desperate need to act: "Now doth reason, honour and conscience command me to be active."¹³² On Thursday 5th or Friday 6th of February, six men, including the Percy brothers and Essex's steward Sir Gilly Meyricke, visited the Globe to request that Shakespeare's company replace, at extremely short notice, the proposed play for that coming Saturday with *Richard II*. In exchange, the actors were offered, in Francis Bacon's words, "forty shillings extraordinary to play it, and so thereupon played it was," for eleven conspirators (Essex was not present), many of whom had previously lunched together, and an indeterminate number of paying spectators. Promoting, in effect, a "coterie audience on a public stage,"¹³³ Meyricke presumably cared little for the size of the house. "So earnest was he [Meyricke] to satisfy his eyes with the sight of that Tragedy," Bacon later told Essex's judges, "which he thought soon after his Lordship should bring from the Stage to the State."¹³⁴

At 10 o'clock the following morning, accompanied by about three hundred followers, Essex left his house on the Strand and headed east toward the City hoping to rouse the support of London's citizens who, emerging from the city's churches, merely looked on. Within twenty-four hours the "rebellion" was crushed and the instigators in custody. Eight to ten days later three statements mentioning the *Richard II* commission were taken, two from conspirators, the other from Augustine Phillips, actor, fellow

¹³² Essex's secret correspondence held in the British Library, MS 31022, is cited in Hammer, Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising," 10.

¹³³ Hammer, "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising," 26.

¹³⁴ *The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban and Lord High Chancellor of England, in ten volumes* (London, 1826), 3:181.

shareholder, and future “housekeeper” of the Globe. Within a week and a half, Essex, Cuffe, Meyricke, Sir Charles Danvers, Christopher Blount, and Captain Henry Lea had been executed for treason. Yet on 24 February, the day that Elizabeth signed Essex’s death warrant and barely a week after delivering his testimony, Phillips and his fellow players performed their traditional Shrove Tuesday play at court. The following day, Ash Wednesday, Essex was executed.

Although its compositional and performance histories are notoriously murky, broad consensus holds that Shakespeare was either completing or augmenting *Hamlet* during the winter of 1600-1. Harold Jenkins, editor of the Arden 2, seems to cover the angles when he writes that, while the *Hamlet* that “has come down to us belongs to 1601, [...] the essential *Hamlet*, minus the passage on the troubles of the actors, it is true, but otherwise differing little if at all from it, was being acted on the stage possibly even before the end of 1599 and certainly in the course of 1600.”¹³⁵ The passage to which Jenkins refers occurs in the Act two, scene two dialogue between Hamlet and his fellow students, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, who inform him of the arrival of “the tragedians of the city” (*Ham* 2.2.327) who have so delighted him in the past. When Hamlet asks why this reputed residential company is on the road, in the 1603 Q1 (sometimes called the “bad” quarto) “Gilderstone” answers briefly that, “the noveltie carries it away, for the principall publicke audience that came to them, are turned to private playes and to the humour of children (*Ham* Q1 Sc.6, 24-49).¹³⁶ The novelty of humorous performing children clearly refers to two time-specific events: the 1600 revivals of the acting

¹³⁵ Harold Jenkins, ed. *Hamlet*, Arden 2 (London: Methuen, 1982), 13.

¹³⁶ *The First Quarto of 'Hamlet'*, ed. Kathleen O. Irace (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998).

companies of the Boys of St. Paul's School and the Children of the Chapel Royal at the Blackfriars. The extended Folio passage (largely following the 1604 Q2), which offers a protracted exchange on the so-called "war of the theaters" erupting at the time, affirms this reading:¹³⁷

There is, sir, an eyrie of children, little eyases, that cry out on top of the question, and are most tyrannically clapped for't. These are now the fashion, and so berattle the common stages [...] that many wearing rapiers are afraid of goose-quills and dare scarce come hither.

(*Ham* 2.2.336-42)

Despite "much to do on both sides" (2.2.350), Rosencrantz judges this a war that the men of Bankside, whose "inhibition comes by the means of the late innovation" (2.2.330), are losing.

Although most scholars view this interchange as a diverting metatheatrical excursion that, in an already bloated play, rarely gets performed, Ann Barton senses an anomaly: "Perhaps the little eyases and their connection with the War of the Theatres, as well as those detailed and quite Renaissance instructions which Hamlet gives to the players, are a trifle intrusive in a play concerned with the workings of fate and character in medieval Denmark."¹³⁸ As Jenkins notes, at the time "innovation" was an especially loaded word connoted with challenges to the social order, which is precisely how Henry IV employs it to characterize the "hurly-burly innovation" (*IH4* 5.1.78) of the Percy rebellion. This meaning is not isolated to the stage; in a letter addressed to Cecil shortly after the Essex uprising, the anonymous writer describes being scandalized by the

¹³⁷ For discussion of this theatrical war, see James P. Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poet's War* (New York: Columbia UP, 2001).

¹³⁸ Anne Barton, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1962), 159.

“popular innovation [of] these late conspiracies.”¹³⁹ Patterson alerts us to further suspicious semantics within the passage. In the essay on “Custom” from Florio’s recently translated *Essays*, Montaigne considers that “the best pretence of innovation or noveltie is most dangerous. [...] It argueth a great selfe-love and presumption, [...] for to establish them, a man must be faine to subvert a publicke peace.”¹⁴⁰ Even “inhibition,” in “pre-Freudian culture,” writes Patterson, implied legal or institutional prohibition.¹⁴¹ Within the completed text of a play that had already been performed, Shakespeare introduces an episode in which, to decode his embedded “buggeswordes,”¹⁴² a celebrated residential theater company suffers some kind of prohibition because of its involvement in an uprising. Rather than expurgating or sanitizing the narrative’s parallels, Shakespeare introduces into his text rhetorical indicators that seem designed to alert us to the synchronicity between his company’s collusion in the events of February 7 and 8 and *Hamlet*’s dramatic narrative of a princely figure adopting the role of playmaker to catch the conscience, perhaps even the crown, of the King.¹⁴³ In other words, Shakespeare reshapes his metatheatrical *Hamlet* material to record the experience of having his art overtaken by life; and in so doing, I suggest, he offers us new ways of thinking about his own status as a factional playwright.

¹³⁹ Jenkins, 471, cites the letter from *The Calendar of the Marquis of Salisbury*, xi.538.

¹⁴⁰ Michel de Montaigne, *Essays*, tr. John Florio (London: Putnam, 1904), 1:118-19. See also Patterson, “Re-Historicizing Shakespeare’s Theater,” 97.

¹⁴¹ Patterson, “Re-Historicizing Shakespeare’s Theater” 98.

¹⁴² *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939), 1:70.

¹⁴³ Hamlet finally admits to Horatio that, apart from killing his father and “whoring” his mother, the reprehensible Claudius has “popp’d in between th’ election and my hopes” (5.2.64-65).

Viewed as part of a broader “innovation,” Hamlet’s negotiation with the actors appropriates sinister undertones. The acknowledged theatre-lover who reacts with a rare display of “joy” (3.1.17) to hear of the players’ arrival and who exhibits easy charm on their meeting (2.2.417-27) shows no qualms at implicating them in treason. In events that now seem to foreshadow the *Richard II* commission, Hamlet hijacks the actor’s planned performance, replacing it with another of their repertory standbys, *The Murder of Gonzago*, which he refashions as *The Mousetrap* for a specific political purpose in a one-off command performance: “You could for a need study a speech of some dozen or sixteen lines, which I would set down and insert in’t, could you not?” Hamlet asks, to which the First Player replies, as perhaps he must: “Ay, my lord” (2.2.534-37). Confronted by this troubled aristocrat’s request that they reenact violent regicide in front of a newly crowned King, the players find themselves in a precarious position. Yet Hamlet, despite knowing of their professional and financial fragility (2.2.329), exploits them with shocking indifference before letting them disappear into the night, presumably unpaid. Shakespeare’s 1601 text renders Hamlet’s reputation as a benevolent patron deeply suspect.

If the players were driven to Elsinore purely out of financial need, then Hamlet’s exploitation of his actors, as a critique of the deferential structures of theatrical patronage, might offer an inverted reflection on the forty shillings that, according to Phillips, sealed the deal for the *Richard II* remount. Yet when the Globe could expect to take in fifty to seventy shillings at the opening of a new play, as Roslyn Knutson has demonstrated, forty

shillings seems a low price for risking professional suicide.¹⁴⁴ Perhaps the players, who never discuss money, seek something else from Hamlet in exchange for their performance: his protection. Hamlet has a history of theatrical patronage, in both the public theaters -- where presumably he learned to recite lines echoing Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage* (2.2.442-93) -- and in private houses among elite audiences. "I heard thee speak me a speech once, but it was never acted," he tells the First Player, "or if it was, not above once -- for the play, I remember, pleased not the million, 'twas caviare to the general" (2.2.430-33). The royal couple, by contrast, deem drama merely a "delight," a pastime (3.1.14-26) that will divert Hamlet from his disturbing thoughts; while Polonius, who embodies an older tradition of university amateur dramatics and is confounded by the multiplicity of newfangled styles -- "tragical-comical-historical-pastoral" (2.2.392-92) -- poses enough of a threat to the professional actors to warrant Hamlet's warning them: "Follow that lord, and look you mock him not" (2.2.538-39). The ruling faction offers bleak prospects for the touring players whereas, under the patronage of Hamlet and his theater-loving friend, Horatio,¹⁴⁵ they at least invest in their professional future. The abuse of even this small measure of self-determination by a patron careless of the actors' welfare offers a tempting correlation with the *Richard II* commissioners, who likely kept their premeditations from the actors.

The Essex faction was a broad church. Despite Essex's being England's Protestant champion, most of *Richard II*'s coterie spectators, notes Hammer, were

¹⁴⁴ Roslyn Knutson, *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company: 1594-1613* (Fayetteville: U of Arkansas P, 1991), 32.

¹⁴⁵ When Hamlet, high on post-performance adrenaline, asks "Would not this, sir, [...] get me a fellowship in a cry of players?", Horatio completes the in-joke: "Half a share" (*Ham* 3.2.269-74).

“Catholics whose loyalty to the Queen was matched by their hostility towards Spain.”¹⁴⁶ Cuffe, conversely, was a pragmatic Puritan. In their characteristic dedications, radical writers of all hues sought not just money but protection under the banner of Essex’s reputed liberalism: whether from the “vile artes, and horrible abominations” of religious moderates who might take offence at Calvinist preacher Henry Holland’s *Treatise against Witchcraft* (1590) or from “the venomous teeth” of scientific skeptics who would outlaw Simon Kellawaye’s medical experiments to find *A Defensive Against the Plague* (1593). In contrast to the theatrical patronage offered by Essex’s close intimates Southampton and Rutland who, in 1600, “passed away their time merely in going to playes every day,”¹⁴⁷ the opposing faction promised little to Shakespeare’s company. Cecil preferred private performance;¹⁴⁸ Raleigh was only an occasional theatergoer; Cobham would doubtless remember the Brooke-baiting his brother had endured as Lord Chamberlain. It seems plausible, then, that Shakespeare and his company, secure in their new home and with a developing sense of their cultural significance, mounted *Richard II* to endorse Essex’s political redemption in order to improve their future prospects. If so,

¹⁴⁶ Monteagle, Blount, the soldier Sir John Davies, and Sir Charles Percy were certainly Catholics, according to Hammer, while Sir Jocelyn Percy and Sir William Constable (who served under Essex in Ireland, “very probably were”: see “Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising,” 26.

¹⁴⁷ So wrote Roland Whyte to Sir Robert Carleton, Sydney Papers, 2.132; cited in “Wriothesley, Henry, third earl of Southampton (1573–1624),” Park Honan in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed. Lawrence Goldman, October 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/view/article/30073> (accessed May 30, 2012).

¹⁴⁸ On December 7 1595, Sir Edward Hoby wrote to Cecil of a planned entertainment at his home two evenings later: “as usual as it shal please you a gate for your supper shal be open: & K. Richard present himself to your vewe”; cited in Chambers, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1930), 320–21.

their discovery the following day that they were implicated in an attempted *coup* must have come as an appalling surprise. Their resulting anxiety would have fuelled the “darkening tone of betrayal” Akrigg senses running through *Hamlet*,¹⁴⁹ perhaps instigating the period of factional disenchantment I explore in the Chapman chapter.

If the 1601 *Hamlet* suggests that the players were prohibited from performing in some way due to their *unforced* engagement with innovation, then Shakespeare’s text also involves a degree of self-scrutiny. Transforming *The Murder of Gonzago* into the political dynamite of *The Mousetrap*, Hamlet determines the power of plays to incite through infiltration, while concurrently delineating the narrow scope of theatrical influence. Hamlet’s belief in theater’s capacity to effect change -- to strike “guilty creatures [...] so to the soul that presently / They have proclaimed their malefactions” (2.2.586-88) -- at first seems borne out in performance: “Give o’er the play,” commands Polonius, as the “frighted” King rises (3.2.259-62). Claudius’s subsequent remorse, however, is both equivocal -- “May one be pardon’d and retain th’offence? (3.3.55-56) -- and brief. As confession gives way to a negotiation about ethics, his eighty-line speech delineates precisely the limits of *The Mousetrap*’s power to prick his conscience. Claudius’ failed contrition suggests that whatever Hamlet has heard about the power of plays to wrench repentance from the souls of “guilty creatures” (2.2.585) is greatly exaggerated. Measured in terms of drama’s capacity to incite or to infect through “imaginative residue,”¹⁵⁰ Shakespeare’s presentation of the ineffectuality of *The Mousetrap* can be interpreted as an excoriating critique of his own company’s flirtation

¹⁴⁹ Akrigg 253.

¹⁵⁰ Thomas Cartelli, *Marlowe, Shakespeare, and the Economy of Theatrical Experience* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), 15.

with conspiracy, an association at once facile and perilous. As such, the absence of official reprimand effectively damned the company with the faintest of praise: they were simply too insignificant to warrant censure. Shakespeare's 1601 *Hamlet* does more than simply hold the mirror up to playing; it turns the reflection upon the playwright. Oblique allusion has evolved into a process of self-revelation, perhaps of confession.

I want to suggest, however, that if we inflect the mirror once again then Hamlet's -- and by interpretive extension, the Essex faction's -- ulterior motives emerge from the apparent failure of their twin theatrical commissions. Hamlet is an oddly visible intriguer who remains hyperactively conspicuous as producer, arbiter, and critic throughout *The Mousetrap*: "Marry, this is miching malicho. It means mischief," he tells Ophelia and the audience at large: "The players cannot keep counsel: they'll tell all"; "I could interpret" (3.2.135, 139, 256). Above all, in underlining the enactment of familial regicide -- "This is one Lucianus, *nephew* to the king" (3.2.239; my italics) -- Hamlet alerts Claudius to the violent revenge he claims to seek. The play, like Hamlet's antic disposition, "not only alarms Claudius," writes Alan Friedman, "It seems designed to do so."¹⁵¹ In other words, consciously or otherwise, Hamlet tries to trap himself rather than his uncle; by setting himself as a lure, he goads his quarry into offensive action. Although the play has little long-term effect on Claudius, fallout from the production is swift: high on his theatrical success Hamlet rashly stabs Polonius and, under the cover of dispatching him to England, an appalled Claudius plots his nephew's death. Unable to commit the revenge demanded

¹⁵¹ Alan Warren Friedman, "Hamlet the Unready," *Modern Language Quarterly* 37.1 (1976), 21.

of him by the ghost of his father, Hamlet uses *The Mousetrap* to force the King's hand, to react, in other words, to the actions of another: "The readiness is all" (5.2.237).

When applied to Shakespeare's Essex analogue, Hamlet's tactic of provocation encourages an interpretation of the *Richard II* commission that challenges both Bacon's official line of seditious public incitement and, more recently, Bate and Hammer's similar conclusions that Essex's "signature play [offered] a bonding exercise [...] a steeling of the will, a visible show of solidarity"¹⁵² in advance of some future "intervention." What neither modern commentator explains is why the faction required visibility at all -- why, if its members wanted a bonding exercise, they did not simply hire the Chamberlain's Men for a cheaper, and safer, private performance.¹⁵³ Based on the factional indicators in the 1601 *Hamlet* text, I hypothesize that the engagement was made not at the behest of the Earl but by his frustrated co-conspirators.

Like Essex, Hamlet suffers from an almost bi-polar personality. On the one hand, as Friedman puts it, "Hamlet the activist [...] braves the ghost, directs a play, murders Polonius, dooms Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, fights pirates, confronts Laertes at Ophelia's grave, fights a duel, and kills Laertes and Claudius at the end. No wonder actors are exhausted by the role." He also possesses, of course, a pronounced tendency for inertia and introspection. Essex was equally dynamic, an inspirational figure and charismatic leader, by reputation almost superhuman -- as was his capacity for self-pity, melancholy, hysterical illness, and episodes of self-lacerating piety that left him

¹⁵² Bate 252. For a similar claim, see Hammer, "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising," 35-36.

¹⁵³ In 1598, Meyricke arranged a soiree at Essex House, in which the Earl and his friends "had two plays, which kept them up until one after midnight"; quoted in Barroll 453.

incapable of coherent thought. That the co-conspirators had to deal with this troubled Essex in the winter of 1600-1 opens up the possibility that the re-commissioned *Richard II* was designed to rouse a procrastinating Essex by forcing the hand of the authorities. Historical events support this hypothesis.¹⁵⁴ Two long strategy meetings held in Southampton's residence in early February broke up "disputatious and undecided."¹⁵⁵ Welsh forces were gathering in the capital and causing suspicion, as was the "general churme and muttering of the great and universal resort to Essex House."¹⁵⁶ The men of action looked to their leader, who proved elusive and uncertain. Essex's steward Meyricke was a hardened Welsh firebrand, more bodyguard than silver polisher, and naturally aggressive. It is entirely possible that he was charged with hiring the Globe not as a crucible to rouse the citizenry, nor as an elaborate private playhouse encouraging eleven elite patrons amid a hired audience of well-wishers, but as a hollow drum possessing a beat loud enough to be heard in the corridors of power over the water.

If *Richard II*, like *The Mousetrap*, was a forcing tactic it was successful: Essex broke cover. He had been made conspicuous by the visibility of his co-conspirators who came to the Globe, as John Donne put it, not only "to see, [but] to be seene".¹⁵⁷ The royal authorities, previously patient, were forced to respond to a perceived declaration of intent. Within hours of the play's conclusion the Privy Council met at the home of Lord

¹⁵⁴ These events conflate accounts from Robert Lacy, *Robert, Earl of Essex* (New York: Athenaeum, 1971), Harrison, and Hammer, "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising."

¹⁵⁵ Lacy 283.

¹⁵⁶ Spedding 9:266.

¹⁵⁷ Satire IV, *The Poetical Works of Dr. John Donne: Containing His Satires, Songs and Sonnets, Epigrams, Elegies, Epithalamions, Letters, Funeral Elegies, Holy Sonnets, &C. &C. &C. To Which Is Prefixed the Life of the Author* (Edinburgh, 1793).

Treasurer Buckhurst, from where two embassies were dispatched to Essex House politely but firmly requesting the Earl's presence. Both were declined. Alerted to his impending arrest, Essex now became, like Hamlet, a man of reaction -- a re-activist -- dramatically bringing the intervention forward to the following morning. Also like Hamlet, his readiness was only partial. An armed contingent from the Welsh marches was still approaching London from the west, a shipment of arms from the Low Countries was yet to dock in the east, and the leaders remained unsure whether to strike for the Palace or the Tower, both of which their opponents were fortifying (the "loving General" found himself trapped, as it were, between the competing topographies of *Henry V*'s fifth act chorus.) Essex must have understood the odds against success, but he took his slim chances anyway. The rebellion was doomed before it began, its demise assisted in part by the *Richard II* production. The authorities, alerted to the imminent threat, were provoked into a suppressing action, which energized the rebels into a precipitous reaction. As with *The Mousetrap*, the performance released energies of containment and suppression, not subversion and insurrection: the *coup d'état* was fatally compromised by the *coup de théâtre* that preceded it.

Nowhere else is Shakespeare's self-reflexive theatricality as "aggressive," writes Harold Bloom, "as it is in *Hamlet*."¹⁵⁸ I contend that the intensity of this professional introspection was fuelled by his personal and professional involvement in the last tragic event of Elizabeth's reign: the Essex rebellion. Like a spinning mirror, the circularity of influence between stage and nature creates a two-way reflection that casts light on the

¹⁵⁸ Harold Bloom, *'Hamlet': Poem Unlimited* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2003), 53.

intentionality behind two politically motivated theatrical commissions -- *Richard II* and *The Mousetrap* -- that trapped their authors. As it revolves, this reflection superimposes onto Hamlet images of both Essex and Shakespeare: a shimmering composite of the theatrical and factional producer, both men, perhaps, betrayed. In the tragedy of *Hamlet*, to borrow Oscar Wilde's phrase, Shakespeare holds a mirror up to the politics of playing, and seems in little mood to laugh at what he sees.¹⁵⁹

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have presented an atypical view of Shakespeare as a factional writer who sustained his commitment to, and participation in, the Essex circle throughout the 1590s. In the following chapter, I position Daniel as the writer chosen by the Essex circle to promote his brand and message among the coterie audiences of the private halls and houses; Shakespeare (and we must assume his company) offered a public platform for the aristocrat with the common touch. Where Daniel's *Civil Wars* clearly influenced the political crafting of Shakespeare's dramatic historiography in the second history cycle -- the Tacitean critiques of Richard's deposition, the lively pattern of reflections between Hal's Prince and Hotspur's pretender -- so Shakespeare's dramaturgy feeds into Daniel's later attempts -- in *The Tragedy of Cleopatra* (1594, rev. 1607), for instance -- to bring his plays out of the closet.¹⁶⁰ In the intertextual analysis of the previous chapter, I also explored the influence both authors brought to bear upon Hayward's *Henrie VIII*.

¹⁵⁹ In *Intention*, Wilde's one-act play, Vivien refutes the comparison between life and art: "this unfortunate aphorism about Art holding the mirror up to Nature, is deliberately said by Hamlet in order to convince the bystanders of his absolute insanity in all art-matters" (Pennsylvania State U: Electronic Classics Series, 2006), 18-19.

¹⁶⁰ For a fuller discussion of this issue, see my Daniel chapter, 218-20.

Chapman's first foray into the Essex circle in 1598 all but post-dates Shakespeare's completion of his history cycle, although Gary Taylor notes minor borrowings from *The Iliad*, which Chapman dedicated to the Achilleian Essex, in the scenes preceding the Battle of Agincourt in *Henry V*.¹⁶¹ If, however, Chapman is the "rival poet" of sonnets 78-86, a possible correlation emerges between Shakespeare's sense of betrayal by his patron over the *Richard II* commission and Chapman's attempts to curry favor with Southampton, the new figurehead of the post-Essex faction in the early years of James's reign. Shakespeare still has a role to play in my final chapter, in which I refigure him as anti-factional and an opponent of a posthumous Essex revival: Shakespeare emerges, rather, as Chapman's rival playwright.

Although Shakespeare's promotion of Essex's aggressive war policy helps explain the uncharacteristically martial, even belligerent tone of *Henry V*, my interpretation of his allusive intentions in *I Henry IV* suggests that his concerns were largely cultural and professional. While Hayward sought a place within the policy-making apparatus by offering acute Tacitean analysis, Shakespeare offered advice on a subject in which he was well versed: the crisis of the private self within the public arena. Whereas Chapman would turn the stage into a soapbox to espouse his anti-absolutist, anti-Jacobean critiques, Shakespeare made politics personal: "I think the King is but a man," says a disguised King Henry, pretending to be but a man, "all his senses have but human conditions" (*H5* 4.1.102-6). Blending media consultancy and proto-psychoanalysis, Shakespeare somewhat resembles an early modern life coach. Where the manuals of Castiglione and Machiavelli taught men to be more successful courtiers and

¹⁶¹ See my Chapman chapter, 269-70.

princes, Shakespeare's later histories encouraged princes and ruling aristocrats to be better men -- to retain and practice their humanity.

Initially, Shakespeare pursued his role with characteristic caution. While Hayward's brazen dedication perhaps exemplifies the dangers of advertising factional ambitions, Shakespeare's tactics of oblique allusion offer a sophisticated methodology for both promoting and critiquing factional interests; by refracting Essex among competing figures Shakespeare creates an analogical methodology that is both evasive and invasive, deflective and reflective. Following the work of Mallin and Patterson, I perceive potential Essexian clusters in other plays of the period -- in the complex negotiations between Mark Antony's military politico and Brutus' ambitious statesman in *Julius Caesar* (1599); between Hector's invasive factionalism and Achilles' antisocial Stoicism in *Troilus and Cressida* (c.1600). Having developed his rubric, however, Shakespeare then set about exposing it. As parallels became more reified, more static -- as in Lady Percy's paean to the dead Hotspur and the choric reference to the "General of our gracious Empress" -- so the playwright's factional affiliations emerged more clearly in works that endured increasing levels of censorship.

The manner in which Shakespeare inserts indicators into his 1601 *Hamlet* text that alert the spectator -- or, given its length, perhaps the reader -- to the play's secret drifts, suggests that this process of political self-revelation was intentional and that, following the betrayal of the commission prior to the Essex uprising, Shakespeare was placing his apostasy on record, broadcasting his departure from the factional stage. Appropriating *Hamlet's* players for his own ends, as the faction had expropriated *Richard II's* for theirs, Shakespeare, by slightly skewing our viewpoint on the politics of playing, offers us his

reading of the events of early February 1601. If the Tacitean extremists within the faction, as they sought to exploit the acoustic resonance of the Chamberlain's Men's state-of-the-art new theater, rendered the players "ciphers to [their] great account" (*H5* Prol. 17), *Hamlet* suggests that, at least in political terms, Shakespeare's "wooden O" was just that -- an empty vessel -- and the players, as he would shortly write in *Macbeth*, "walking shadow[s] full of sound and fury signifying nothing" (*Mac* 5.5.26-29).

Adopting an increasingly anti-factional position, Shakespeare's post-Essex dramas, as I argue in the final chapter, scrutinize the fraught relationship between players and princes and the futile notion that the performing of power could amount to anything more than playing at politics.

Chapter Three

Samuel Daniel and the Eloquence of Silence

Introduction

A “poet’s poet while he lived,”¹ Samuel Daniel (1562-1619) undoubtedly garnered the respect of his contemporaries, if not necessarily their affection. Despite the “exquisite paynes and puritie” of his verse and his blanced and “Polished Historickes,”² Daniel’s writing, always integral to his thinking in literary and political philosophy, was subject to acute circumspection and a gnawing reticence to commit. A reluctant author and studied amateur, he obsessively revised his work as a process of both rescinding and improving his authority. “I say no more, I[‘ve] feare I sayd too much,” concludes *Delia* (1592 [revised 1594]), an early sonnet sequence that, Daniel’s dedication protests too much, should have been “consecrated to silence” but for the “indiscretion of a greedie printer” (*Delia* 1:77.33).³ The loss of voice motif and the trope of “Dombé eloquence” (*The Complaint of Rosamond* 1:85.130) can be traced throughout Daniel’s work. Yet what to the influential French poets Joachim Du Bellay and Phillipe Desportes “is an aesthetic [...] of change and uncertainty in all epistemological fields,” Christina Sukic considers a crisis in Daniel at once more intimate and more ideological: “His melancholy

¹ “As certainly as Spenser, [Daniel] was a poet’s poet while he lived,” writes Arthur Quiller-Couch in *Adventures in Criticism* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1896), 48.

² Thomas Nashe, “Piers Penniless’ Supplication” (London: 1592), fo.17; and Tailboys Dimoke, *Caltha Poetorum* [The Marigold of the Poets], (1599), quoted in cited in Cecil Seronsy, *Samuel Daniel* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1967), 19.

³ For citation of Daniel’s works other than *Philotas*, I refer to *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Samuel Daniel*, 1885-96, in five volumes, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963). References are cited in-text by volume, stanza, and line. Prose works are cited by volume and page.

tone and silent rhetoric are characteristic of a troubled, distressed self, anxious to raise his voice as a poet and to become public, and at the same time conscious of the frailty of words.”⁴ Difficult to construe, hard to pin down, the “well-languaged”⁵ Daniel is not, paradoxically, an easy man to read.

The Tragedy of Philotas (1605),⁶ the central contentious work of this chapter and a play the Privy Council threatened to silence, is certainly a canonical contradiction. Typical of Renaissance writers, Daniel turned his measured hand to many genres: to the sonnet sequence (*Delia*, 1590) and the lyric poem (*The Complaint of Rosamond*, 1592); to English history in both verse (*Civil Wars*, 1595-1609) and prose (*The Collection of the History of England*, 1612-18); to the epistle as rhymed complaint (*A Letter from Octavia to Marcus Antonius*, 1599) and as philosophical treatise (the collected *Epistles* of 1603). He was even, to Ben Jonson’s derision, an occasional creator of masques (*The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* [1604] and *Tethys Festival* [1610]). Yet he was rarely more than the most closeted of dramatists. His first play *The Tragedy of Cleopatra*, written to commission in 1594 (revised in 1607) in imitation of the neo-classical French dramatist Robert Garnier, eschewed the robust theatricality of the Elizabethan stage for a refined Senecan inertia favoring long speeches to be read in private rooms rather than dialogue to

⁴ Christine Sukic, “‘Things Uttered to My Self, and Consecrated to Silence’: Samuel Daniel’s Silent Rhetoric,” in *The Rhetoric of Silence in Early Modern English Literature* (Universite Paris Diderot: L’Institut d’Etudes anglophones, 2007), 113.

⁵ See Thomas Nashe, *Piers Pennilesse* (1592); and William Browne, *Britannia’s Pastoral’s* (1613).

⁶ *The Tragedy of Philotas by Samuel Daniel*, ed. Lawrence Michel (Yale: Yale UP, 1950), viii. All subsequent quotations from *Philotas*, along with its paratexts and its editorial commentary, are taken from Michel, and shall be cited (where necessary, with page numbers) in-text. It should be noted that, while *Philotas* is divided by act and scene, lineation is accumulative.

be acted upon public stages. In fact, his disdain of the playhouses and their audiences offers one of Daniel's few consistent positions. In the preface to his long philosophical poem *Musophilus, or Defence of all Learning* (1603)) he reassured Fulke Greville, who, in 1601, "the Earle of Essex then falling [...] sacrificed in the fire" his own closet drama *Antony and Cleopatra*:⁷

I doe not here upon this hum'rous Stage
Bring my transformed Verse, appareled
With others passions, or with other's rage;
With loves, with wounds, with factions furnished.
(*Musophilus* 1.225)⁸

Yet in the spring of 1605 the authorities accused Daniel of presenting precisely this kind of passionate, angry, factional material in response to the staging of *Philotas* at Whitehall "before the Kinges Ma^{tie} by the Quenes Ma^{ts} Children of the Revells" for the New Year's entertainments.⁹ *Philotas* concentrates on the final days of the brilliant but arrogant Macedonian cavalry commander who, along with his father Parmenio[n], had helped Alexander the Great to triumph over Darius in the Persian Wars of 334-330 BC. Beloved of his soldiers, Philotas nevertheless makes dangerous enemies of Alexander's courtiers, who he berates for "idolizing feeble Majestie [...] To make the King forget he is a man" (1.1.70-72). His failure to pass on the news of an alleged aristocratic conspiracy

⁷ Fulke Greville, *Life of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1907), 93.

⁸ Aside from *Philotas*, all Daniel citations are from *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Samuel Daniel*, 1885-96, ed. Rev. Alexander B. Grosart (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), in five volumes. References are cited in-text by volume, stanza and line; prose works by volume and page.

⁹ For details see, Lucy Munro, *Children of the Queen's Revels* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005), 139-42, and Michel 36-37. R.E. Brettell, "Samuel Daniel and the Children of the Queen's Revels, 1604-5," *Review of English Studies* 3.10 (1927), presumes that the play was first produced at the Blackfriars in the autumn of 1604, though there is no record of performance, 162-68.

is seized upon by the King's close advisors Ephestion and Craterus who, turning Alexander against his commander, engineer Philotas's trial, torture, and execution, along with the assassination of Parmenio. While this story was not new -- marginal glosses in the play text acknowledge both Plutarch's *Alexander* and Quintus Curtius's *De rebus Alexandri*¹⁰ -- Daniel's treatment smacked of innovation to a Privy Council that seemingly judged *Philotas* a blatant and seditious commentary on the Essex trial four years earlier.

Due to a break in the records of the *Acts of the Privy Council* from 1601-13, evidence of Daniel's summons to defend *Philotas* before the Privy Council comes largely from his personal testimony. In the first of two autographed letters written in the spring of 1605 he apologized for the "great erro^r" of inadvertently characterizing his patron Charles Mountjoy as another Philotas who knew too much. "[F]irst I told the Lordes I had written 3 Acts of this tragedie," he concedes, "and had reade some parte of it to yo^r ho:" (qtd. in Michel 38). In the second letter Daniel promised Robert Cecil, newly entitled Viscount Cranborne: "I will finde the meanes to let [*Philotas*] fall of it self, by w^tdrawing the booke & mee to my poore home."¹¹ Daniel did not, however, follow through on the offer, within months exploiting his newfound notoriety by publishing *Certaine small poems lately printed with the tragedie of Philotas*. Two years later the play received its own imprint in a text that, although it included some five thousand grammatical emendations,

¹⁰ See Thomas North, *Plutarch's Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans*, 1579, ed. George Wyndham, 12 vols, vol. 4 (New York: AMS Press, 1967); and Quintus Curtius Rufus, *History of Alexander*, trans. John C. Rolfe, 2 vols, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1946).

¹¹ Both letters are quoted in full in Michel 37-39.

made no attempt to mitigate the offending Essex material.¹² Daniel's lack of contrition perhaps helps explain why his lengthy prose Apology of 1605, which refutes the "wrong application, and misconceiving of this Tragedy [...] to the late Earle of Essex" (qtd. in Michel 157), only appeared in the *Philotas* paratexts of the 1623 *Whole Workes of Samuel Daniel* four years after the poet's death.

While the ingratiating letters conceal the exact cause of his interrogation, Daniel's uncharacteristically belligerent Apology suggests that *Philotas*'s alleged sedition owed as much to its compositional chronology as to its political synchronicity. Daniel's reluctant concession that "any resemblance" to Essex, however misconceived, "can hold in no proportion but only in his weaknesses" (qtd. in Michel 157) speaks, if at all, to the first three acts, which present a hotheaded, violent, and lascivious Philotas withholding treasonous information from his King. Although he avoids exact dates, in his Apology Daniel implies that he wrote these early acts in the summer of 1600, "neere halfe a yeare before the late Tragedy of ours purposing to have had its partial form presented in Bath by certaine Gentlemens sons, as a private recreation for the Christmas, before the Shrovetide of that unhappy disorder." Laying it aside in the winter of 1601, "by reason of some occasion then falling out" [presumably the Essex rebellion], Daniel only resumed *Philotas* in 1604, "driven," he writes, "by necessity to make use of my pen, and the Stage to be the mouth of my lines, which before were never heard to speake but in silence" (qtd. in Michel 155-56). *Philotas*, then, is schizophrenic. Politically, it is both Essexian and post-Essexian; historically, it is "Jacobethan," begun under Elizabeth and ended

¹² For a full discussion of the emendations, see Michel 78-92.

under James; and generically it originated in the closet but aired, quite catastrophically, in public.

According to recent scholars, the radical shift in tone and focus of the final two acts provoked the suspicions of the Privy Council, especially the striking parallels between the trials of Essex in 1601 and Chapman's *Philotas* in 1604. Chief among these, notes Michel, are points of law concerning witnesses' testimonies, jurisprudence regarding the technical charge of treason, and the animus of the prosecutors in the face of the defendant's proud demeanor in the moment of his condemnation.¹³ Recently, Hugh Gazzard substantiated this reading, ascribing 250 of the 530 lines in the trial scene (4.1) as Daniel innovations that replace the field court martial of classical history with matter more appropriate to an early modern court trial.¹⁴ "In total," concludes John Pitcher, "the case Gazzard presents makes it impossible to believe any longer that the connections and parallels between the play and the earl's trial and execution were unintended."¹⁵

Attempting to understand, if not to justify, the Privy Council's anxieties over Daniel's resumption of *Philotas*, Michel offers an etymological solution that bears striking similarity to my factional reading of *Hamlet* in the previous chapter:

Daniel began, perhaps with Essex in the back of his mind, to use a historical figure to portray "the frailty of greatnesse, and the usuall workings of ambition." [T]he Essex case made him return to his subject, and change its tenor into an indictment of tyranny and the intrigues of courtiers."¹⁶

¹³ Michel 51-66.

¹⁴ Hugh Gazzard, "'Those Grave Presentiments of Antiquitie': Samuel Daniel's *Philotas* and the Earl of Essex," *Renaissance English Studies* 51.203 (2000), 441.

¹⁵ John Pitcher, "Samuel Daniel and the Authorities," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 10 (1998), 118.

¹⁶ Michel vii

Michel here suggests that what began as a critique of Essex in the didactic, humanist vein that we have already encountered in Hayward and, to a lesser degree, in Shakespeare was radically altered mid-composition by the failed rebellion and Essex's subsequent conviction for treason. In other words, the semi-private theater of Essex's trial once again made its way into a play that, like *Hamlet*, was already under construction. Whereas Essex's rebellion expanded the *Hamlet* narrative, his subsequent trial rearranged entirely the contours of *Philotas*.

Yet the Daniel factionalists,¹⁷ despite their characterization of *Philotas* as "a barrister's play" and a "*drame a clef*,"¹⁸ struggle to prove their case beyond reasonable doubt for lack of a credible motive for *Philotas* in either its partial or completed state. Michel's argument, that the censorious first three acts reveal that Daniel "like other moderate Essexians [...] was already tempering his allegiance with some fairly extensive reservations about the earl,"¹⁹ would make more sense in 1598-99 (as it did for Hayward and Shakespeare) when a belligerent Essex probably needed placating than in 1600 when, stripped of his Irish command and under house arrest, he was facing utter ruin. Conversely, Gazzard's reading of the final two acts as "an attempt, if not to exonerate Essex, then at least to stress the indeterminacy of his guilt," sits oddly with the "profound disillusionment with contemporary politics" he imagines Daniel experienced in the

¹⁷ Brent Stirling, "Daniel's *Philotas* and the Essex Case," *MLQ* 3 (1942), 583-94, was the first scholar to put forward a factional reading of *Philotas*. For other (more or less) adherents, see Cecil Seronsy, *Samuel Daniel* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1967), 52-57; and Richard Dutton, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1991), 169.

¹⁸ Pitcher, "Daniel and the Authorities," 117, and Gazzard 423.

¹⁹ Michel 63.

aftermath of the failed rebellion.²⁰ Put bluntly, why would Daniel bother? Why would he risk liberty and career for a dead Earl and a moribund faction? In this chapter, I hope to demonstrate that the case for Daniel's factional engagement can be proved, or at least better understood, by expanding the compositional chronology even further so as to complicate Michel and Gazzard's bipolar reading of *Philotas*, with its misleading paradox of Daniel critiquing a living patron and championing a dead one. I read Daniel's apparent sudden proselytism of Essex in 1604 as the release of pent-up political anxieties that can be traced back at least to the play's inception, a date also recorded in the "Apology." "[A]bove eight yeares since, meeting with my deare friend *D. Lateware*, (whose memory I reverence) in his Lords Chamber, and mine," Daniel recalls, "I told him the purpose I had for *Philotas*."²¹

Daniel's Apology, therefore, offers a lifecycle for *Philotas* from conception through inception to completion spanning the period 1597-1604, the three stages aligning with Essex's post-Cadiz apotheosis, his post-Ireland nadir, and his post-Elizabethan resurrection in print and the popular imagination. Through drilling into this textual cross-section, I will examine the core samples for traces of Daniel's relationship to the Essex circle and to the other factional writers, both at points of contact and, crucial to Daniel's aesthetics, at points of silence. Due to Daniel's obsessive revisionist tendencies, his work is particularly suited to this kind of textual archeology: his verse history *The Civil Wars* (1595, 1599, 1601, and 1609) and *Cleopatra* (1594, 1599, 1601, and 1607, when the play was recast arguably for the public stage), are similar "Jacobethan" texts, whose additions

²⁰ Gazzard 448.

²¹ Michel 155.

or rewrites offer potential clues to Daniel's shifting political attitudes. Put another way, I want to suggest that if we consider *Philotas* as articulated rather than single-jointed then the play becomes, like Shakespeare's reference to Essex as Elizabeth's "gracious general [...] from Ireland coming / Bringing rebellion broached on his sword" (*Henry V* C.5, 29-31), a culmination, albeit a desperate one, rather than an aberration. I specifically want to argue that the 1597-1604 *Philotas* offers a compelling reflection of a faction under stress and a record of artistic and political crisis in Daniel provoked by a developing fear of impending Jacobean absolutism and the moral compunction to speak out, to fill the factional silence following Essex's death.

I shall, accordingly, develop my argument along the lines of the three compositional stages mentioned above. In the next section, "1597: Conception," I consider Daniel's proximity to the Essex circle leading up to and informing *Philotas*. Although Daniel's acquisition of powerful benefactors surpassed even John Donne's, there lurked behind the likes of Mary Pembroke, Fulke Greville, Lord Mountjoy, Lady Cumberland, and Lucy Clifford, the powerful figure of Essex. Passages in *The Civil Wars*, *Musophilus*, and *A Funerall Poeme upon the Earle of Devonshire* (1607-9) suggest that Daniel's association with Essex, mediated through his long friendship with Mountjoy, was more intimate than he cared to admit in print. Moreover, his impact upon other Essexian writers of the period, such as Shakespeare and Spenser, speaks to his authority within the circle and to the nature of his political commitments as he sought for a literary vehicle to accommodate his faction's grievances and expectations following Cadiz.

In “1600: Inception,” I read the first three acts of *Philotas* both as a philosophical discourse and as a thinly veiled political treatise urging caution to a faction in crisis. In the aftermath of the Irish debacle, with Essexian moderates urging reconciliation, Daniel organizes his narrative into a complex debate about the eloquence of dumbness and the folly of eloquence, the literary tropes of his earlier continental verses reshaped into ideological imperatives. The tension between disclosure and silence and between participation and withdrawal, runs right through Daniel’s work, a product of his deepest ethical and literary anxieties. Yet within the context of a developing Neo-Stoicism from the continent that would increasingly shape the post-Essex faction, I suggest that Daniel’s call for retreat was neither submissive nor apolitical, but an attempt at re-gathering dispersed forces.

In the last section, “1604: Completion,” I consider what dragged Daniel out of the closet and onto the stage. Michel hypothesizes that Daniel fell under the suspicion of the authorities not only because of his long-standing association with the Essex circle but because of his long-held condemnation of the public stage, which would have made his sudden histrionics all the more incriminating.²² I consider whether *Philotas*, followed closely by the re-cast *Cleopatra*, implies compromise by Daniel toward the popular drama or allegiance to its factional playwrights: Shakespeare, Jonson, and Chapman. I conclude that Daniel’s anxiety over royal tyranny, which becomes increasingly explicit as the play progresses, finally overrules his loyalty to national unity and his aversion to playwriting. In staging a drama about the dangers of tyranny and the iniquities of

²² Michel 49.

absolutism in front of the King, Daniel loudly, if briefly, heralded the emergence of a post-Essex faction that would soon become a thorn in James's administration.

1597: Conception.

In this section, I shall argue that, due to his longstanding personal and literary commitments to the Essex circle, the diffident and circumspect Daniel was a logical candidate for a faction seeking to advertize its progressivist Protestant ambitions for an imperial Britain. In his *Apology*, Daniel recalls *Philotas*'s genesis with some thoroughness:

[A]bove eight yeares since, meeting with my deare friend *D. Lateware*, (whose memory I reverence) in his Lords Chamber, and mine, I told him the purpose I had for *Philotas*, who sayd himselfe had written the same argument, and caused it to be presented in *S^t. John's Colledge in Oxford*, Where as I after heard, it was worthily and with great applause performed. And though, I sayd, he had therein prevented me, yet I would not desist, whensoever my Fortunes would give me peace, to try what I could doe in the same subject, where unto both hee, and who were present, encouraged me as to an example worthy of note.

(*Apology*, qtd. in Michel 155-56)

Despite its tangible detail there are numerous shadows in this recollection. Who was Daniel visiting, and who else was present? Was he passing through Oxford or was he summoned? And what kind of "example worthy of note" might *Philotas*'s decline and fall offer the Essex faction? Considering the personalities involved, there can be little doubt that the Oxford meeting had a factional subtext. Dr. Richard Lateware was the epitome of the Essexian follower. He was, according to David Erskine Baker, not only "a very ingenious Latin epigrammatic poet," but also a fiery preacher and soldier, who was

subsequently killed in action while serving under Mountjoy in Ireland in July 1601.²³ The fact that Lateware was Mountjoy's personal chaplain in 1597 suggests that the men were likely meeting with Mountjoy in his Oxford chambers.²⁴

Lateware's play, now lost, was written before 1587, which makes a reference by Lord Henry Howard in a letter to Essex of August 1597 particularly tantalizing: "If ever I find change wher I desir most to establish permanente contente the last wurdes that I to y^w shall utter I shall conclude wth that brefe sentence of Philotas at his end."²⁵

Aristocratic, sage, yet fiercely loyal to Essex during this period,²⁶ Howard evokes Philotas's fidelity in the face of neglect and some unspoken yet radical change: no reference is made to his treasonous ambition. If, as Gazzard suggests, Howard was quoting from Lateware's obscure college play, he either possessed a quite formidable memory or the text had recently gained renewed currency. Was Howard at the 1597 meeting in Oxford in which the Philotas allegory was revived? Was Essex himself present? The discussions around Philotas would certainly have matched Essex's mood following the Azores, or "Islands," Voyage earlier in the year, a debacle that dented his military reputation and financially ruined many of his followers. Shame soon turned to fury when Elizabeth created the High Admiral (another Howard) Earl of Nottingham,

²³ David Erskine Baker, Isaac Reed, and Stephen Jones, *Biographica Dramatica; or, a Companion to the Playhouse*, 2 vols, (London: Longman, 1812), 1:445.

²⁴ For details on Lateware, see Gazzard 431.

²⁵ Lambeth Palace Library, MS 661, fo. 238^b. Gazzard, who quotes this letter (432), also cites Lateware's reference to his earlier play, though he does not give a source.

²⁶ Sir Henry Wotton, in *A Parallel Betweene Robert Late Earle of Essex, and George Late Duke of Buckingham* (London 1641), describes Howard as "commonly *primae admissionis* [with Essex], by his bed-side in the morning," 6.

thereby supplanting Essex in aristocratic precedence.²⁷ Essex's increasingly belligerent and maverick attitude galvanized his opponents, inflamed his supporters, and fed his developing paranoia. While Shakespeare explored notions of rebellion and aristocratic entitlement through the dramatic rendition of Essex's forebear, the Earl of Hereford, later Henry IV, on the public stage, it seems likely that his circle sought alternative allusive ways to excite Essexian support in the colleges and private halls through dramatic readings and closet dramas. Less clear is why Daniel was deemed appropriate to the task.

Daniel hardly cuts a radical figure and, despite his long association with the Essex circle, his involvement in politics remains enigmatic and equivocal.²⁸ He is not so much apolitical as politically ambiguous, a proclivity Samuel Taylor Coleridge captured in a letter he wrote to Charles Lamb after re-reading *The Civil Wars*:

I cannot but fancy a plain England-loving English country gentleman, with only some dozen books in his whole library [...] diffident and passive, yet rather inclined to Jacobitism, seeing the reasons of the revolutionary party, yet, by disposition and old principles, leaning, in quiet nods and sighs, at his old parlour fire, to the hereditary right.²⁹

Daniel's sympathy for political reformation, though checked by his reactionary anxieties, his bookishness and prudence, and his rather melancholy reticence, speaks to the considerable influence of his first patron, the gifted and well-connected Mary Herbert,

²⁷ For details of this difficult time in Essex's career, see Paul Hammer, "Myth-Making: Politics, Propaganda and the Capture of Cadiz in 1596," *The Historical Journal* 40.3 (1997), 621-42; also see Hammer, "Devereux, Robert, Second Earl of Essex (1565–1601)," *ODNB* (2008), online edition, 2004.

²⁸ For character studies of Daniel, see Rees, 60-68, and Gillian Wright, "Samuel Daniel's Use of Sources in *The Civil Wars*," *Studies in Philology* 101.1 (2004), 59-64. Grosart offers a compendious collection of quotations concerning Daniel in "Memorial Introduction – Critical," 4: vii-lvii.

²⁹ Quoted in William Hazlitt, *Johnson's Lives of the British Poets*, 4 vols, (London: Nathaniel Cook, 1854), 1:177.

Countess of Pembroke, wife of Henry, sister of Sidney, patron of Spenser, and friend of Fulke Greville and numerous other literary luminaries. Daniel's recollection of Wilton, the Sidney countryseat, as "my best Schoole"³⁰ recalls the collegiate atmosphere and literary refinement of a Pembroke Circle that embraced and nurtured its "well-languaged"³¹ poet from 1591 to 1594. Daniel's major accomplishments while at Wilton -- the completed sonnet sequence *Delia* and *The Complaint of Rosamond*, a narrative poem in rhyme royal -- confirmed him as the master of the English *dolce vita* (a style privileging smoothness in rhyme and meter) and as a young writer to watch; "a new shepherd late upsprong," wrote Edmund Spenser, "The which doth all afore him far surpasses."³²

Daniel's literary education was not entirely esoteric, however. Sheltered in their ivory tower, and political theorists rather than activists, the Wiltonites read literature, language, and the politics of self-determination as inextricably linked. Their ambitious credo to reform both society and letters presumed literature to be political and political analysis literary: Tacitus offered the apparatus and Sidney gave the circle its voice. If Essex inherited the dying Sidney's sword on the battlefield of Zutphen in 1591, the less bellicose Daniel soon adopted Sidney's literary mantle as "manifesto writer"³³ for the group's humanist and literary ideals, and his *A Defence of Ryme* (1602), a rejoinder to

³⁰ This phrase comes from Daniel's dedication of *A Defence of Ryme* (1603) to Mary Pembroke's son, William, who Daniel probably taught while at Wilton, 4:36.

³¹ William Browne's phrase comes from *Britannia's Pastoral* (London: Clark, 1845), Song 1, 2:2.303.

³² Edmund Spenser, *Colin Clouts, Come Home Again* (1594), in *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*, ed William Oram, Einar Bjorvand, and Ronald Bond (Cambridge, Mass: Yale UP, 1989), 519-62.

³³ Michel v.

Thomas Campion's attack on English rhyme, builds on Sidney's *The Defense of Poesy* [1581, 1595]). The group's peculiar blend of conservative radicalism was articulated in not entirely harmonious calls to reform the rude English stage on the model of French Senecanism, while reclaiming the rights of Anglo-Saxon meter and rhyme from the dominant humanist obsession with "the Greeks or Latines."³⁴ This import-export literary dichotomy was only one of the circle's many paradoxes: Protestant interventionism abroad conjoined with feudal recidivism at home; aristocratic entitlement vied with republican sentiment; sympathy for the commonwealth mingled with envy of the privy chamber. Recuperation and reformation formed the polarities of a circle that concerned itself less with the pragmatics of Machiavellian statecraft than with the ethics of political idealism. As "outside critics," the group could castigate the extremes of tyranny and anarchy unburdened by the needs of government to find compromise. "If it were to be asked whether Daniel and his associates were, with regard to the fundamental opposites of government, monarchists or republicans," Michel admits, "it would have to be answered, Neither – and both."³⁵ While Mary Pembroke could afford the luxury of her philosophical ideals, Daniel's career could not. Perhaps inevitably, there followed a parting of the ways.

We do not know for sure why Daniel and Mary Pembroke fell out, nor exactly when, but in the opening stanzas of *The Civil Wars*, entered in the Stationers Register in

³⁴ In *Musophilus*, Daniel predicts that the "sacred Relickes" of Chaucer's rhyme will whither "upon the fulnesse of a cloy'd Neglect" (157, 170) and the perpetual innovations that "runne an idle counter-course" (77-78).

³⁵ Michel 10.

October 1594, Daniel expresses deep gratitude to a new patron for saving him from destitution:

And thou *Charles Mountjoy* borne the worldes delight
That has receiv'd unto thy quiet shore
Mee tempest-driven fortune-tossed wight,
Tir'd with expecting, and could hope no more.
(*CW* 1:5.1-4)

Perhaps Daniel had grown “tir'd with expecting” promises of financial support that never accrued? Perhaps his proposed historical epic of “tumultuous Broyles, / And bloody factions” (*CW* 2:1.1-2) contravened Lady Pembroke’s literary plans for her protégé?³⁶ But perhaps also Daniel was feeling suffocated? In *Musophilus*, his self-reflexive poem of 1599, Daniel recalls the Wilton years in purgatorial terms: “I cannot brook that face, which dead-alive / Shewes a quicke body, but a buried will” (139-40). It seems to me that *Musophilus* recollects anxieties that go deeper even than financial insecurity or artistic integrity, namely fear of professional neglect:

Then where is that proud Title of thy name,
Written in yce of melting vanitie?
Where is thine heir left to possesse the same?
Perhaps, not so well as in beggarie.
Something may rise to go beyond the shame
Of vile and unregarded Povertie.
(*Musophilus* 130-35)

With his constitutional blend of self-doubt and self-affirmation, though in uncharacteristically staccato, end-stopped lines, Daniel’s sentiments oscillate between glorious anonymity and a desire to matter, to be at the heart of things: “To do worthy the

³⁶ Whether tactful or tactical, the undedicated first edition of the 1595 *Civil Wars* signaled a breach in literary relations between Daniel and Pembroke that lasted, at least in print, until the final 1609 edition of the poem, which included both a dedication and an embedded paean to “*Mary Pembroke* (by whose generous brow, / And noble graces, I delineate / These shapes of others virtues),” 8:76.1-3.

writing, and to write / Worthy the reading” (199-200). At this stage in his career, Daniel wanted to get closer to the action, to exchange the political philosophizing of the Pembroke Circle for the *realpolitik* world of the Essex faction. And Charles Mountjoy – or Blount, Daniel uses both names – was the man to get him there.

In *A Funerall Poeme, Upon the Death of the late noble Earl of Devonshire* (Mountjoy’s title from 1603), which was written following his patron’s death in 1606,³⁷ Daniel seems to value Mountjoy above all others as the reader worthy his writing: “Thou had’st read / Man and his breath so well [...] And knew as much as ever learning knew” (60-61). In the face of such candid gratitude here and throughout the canon, commentators universally consider Daniel’s relationship to Mountjoy as paramount; more than Daniel’s “chief patron,” writes Seronsy, Mountjoy was also an “old friend.”³⁸ I assume, therefore, that Daniel met Mountjoy at Wilton, and through him was introduced to Essex; and the latter attachment, according to Rees, “was to have a profound effect” on Daniel “in later years.”³⁹ Although both Earls were frequent visitors to Wilton,⁴⁰ it strikes me that Essex’s deeper attachment to the Sidneys, along with his higher status, would make it equally, if not more likely that *he* introduced Daniel to Mountjoy. My purpose here is not to diminish Mountjoy’s relations with Daniel but to challenge a hierarchy of patronage based solely on the nature and frequency of textual citation. Like Shakespeare,

³⁷ Lord Rich divorced Penelope, sister to Essex, in the aftermath of the rebellion, whereupon she married Mountjoy, her long-time lover; the scandal perhaps contributed to Mountjoy’s early death at forty.

³⁸ Seronsy 123.

³⁹ Rees 64.

⁴⁰ Michel draws this conclusion based on the analyses of Emilie A. Newcomb’s Ph.D dissertation, “The Countess of Pembroke’s Circle” (U of Wisconsin, Madison, 1937), 8.

Daniel makes few direct references to Essex, though, unlike Shakespeare, he does claim in the Apology to *Philotas* to have received direct patronage. And, as I shall later discuss, Essex's occasional appearances in verse become fewer the closer Daniel ventures to the centre of the circle. But I want to argue that, whether out of self-preservation or concern for his political master, during the period 1594-99, and especially in *The Civil Wars*, Daniel fashions Mountjoy as a deputy for Essex -- a decoy on the field of history, as it were -- and as a surrogate for both the Essex faction and Daniel's relation to it.

Mountjoy was certainly qualified to deputize poetically for Essex as one of the triumvirate of the Earl's closest friends, along with Southampton and Rutland, though the striking homogeneity between the two men was troublesome both to themselves and to others. Determining to reverse his ancient family's declining fortunes, the young Mountjoy would quickly prove himself, in Edmund Lodge's words, "an ornament equally to the characters of soldier, statesman, scholar and courtier."⁴¹ Lodge's paean might equally describe Essex, and the parallel was not lost at court in the 1580s, where the fledgling courtier soon rivaled Essex. Mountjoy's good looks and intellectual prowess attracted Elizabeth's admiration and Essex's jealousy, and a duel resulted from which the two men emerged largely unscathed and the greatest of friends. Both had a glamorous disregard for authority and a proclivity for introspection with a political outlook founded on domestic toleration and foreign intervention, so it is hardly surprising that the ever-cautious Elizabeth limited their joint military adventures (Mountjoy accompanied Essex

⁴¹ *Portraits of Illustrious Personages of Great Britain* (London: Harding, Mavor & Lepard, 1834), 3:77.

to the Azores, but not to Cadiz) and manipulated their affections.⁴² Yet Mountjoy remained loyal in the face of his friend's increasingly unstable behavior following the Azores debacle and resisted Cecil's offers of an alliance in wooing the Scottish king (instead delivering secret letters from Essex to James). Other than their political outlook, temperaments, and affection for Penelope Rich, the two men also shared a residence – a seemingly minor point that, I suggest, reveals Daniel's extremely close relations to Essex leading up to *Philotas*.

According to lines added to the 1601 revision of *The Civil Wars*, what Mountjoy offered the destitute Daniel in 1594 was not money (of which the Earl had little) but refuge. Imagining his poem as an edifice (a common trope for a poet who never enjoyed a home of his own), Daniel barter payment in kind for his patron's support: "I, who heretofore have liv'd by thee, / Doo give thee now a roome to live with me" (2:5.7-8). Later, in the 1609 *Funerall Poeme on the Earle of Devonshire*, Daniel names that refuge when he wistfully recalls "solitary *Wansteed*, where your care / Had gathered all what heart or eyes delight" (81-82), and he celebrates the contents of Mountjoy's library, with "its many volumes that so much contain'd" (79). Daniel, whose career as an historian depended on access to rare books, commemorates, in Pitcher's words, "the encouragement and intellectual support of a cultivated and scholarly aristocrat, as well as

⁴² In correspondence with her favorite, the Queen seemed to enjoy playing Essex against Mountjoy, repeatedly asking to be remembered to "good Mountjoy" (July 1597) and to "faithful Mountjoy" (24 July 1597). Conversely, in the strained Irish correspondence, the Queen calls Mountjoy "Mistress Kitchenmaid," referencing both his marginally lower status and his need to clean up after the Essex debacle (3 Dec 1600); cited in *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, eds Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2002), 386-400.

access to a well-stocked library (in this case, at Mountjoy's home, Wanstead House)."⁴³

Pitcher's sentiments are perfectly sound in all but one respect: at this time Wanstead was home not to Mountjoy but to Essex.

The oversight is understandable.⁴⁴ Mountjoy, who treated Wanstead as a country residence, bought it from Essex just prior to the Irish expedition in 1599. He was later married and buried there within the space of a year, as Daniel reminisces in the 1609 *Civil Wars*: "So humble *Rodon*, *Wainsteeds* sweete delight, / That waters *Mountjoyes* solitarie rest" (7:10.1-2). But in 1593 the estate passed to Essex through his mother's marriage to the Earl of Leicester. Essex had vast estates in the west, most of which he never visited; but Wanstead, situated just northeast of London, became his country retreat in times of crisis. "He retired to Wanstead," wrote John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton on 30 August 1598, following Essex's notorious ear boxing by the Queen for having laid hand to sword, "where they say he meanes to settle, seing he cannot be receved in court."⁴⁵ We can assume that during similar retreats from London following the crisis generated by the Doleman dedication in 1594, Cadiz in 1597, and the Azores in 1598, Essex vented his spleen in the company of his houseguest, Mountjoy, and his poet-in-residence, Daniel. Increasingly perceived, along with Essex House in London, as a counter-court of discontent, Wanstead was not as "solitarie" as Daniel indicated.

⁴³ Pitcher, *ODNB*.

⁴⁴ Commenting on the powerful "nearly physical" presence of Daniel's patron in his work, Alzada Tipton also mistakenly describes Wanstead as "Mountjoy's House"; see "Caught between 'Virtue' and 'Memorie': Providential and Political Historiography in Samuel Daniel's *The Civil Wars*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 61 3/4 (1998), 334.

⁴⁵ Chamberlain, *Letters*, 1:41. Hammer, *Polarization* (277), confirms the significance of Wanstead to Essex in the 1590s: "Aside from those occasions when he traveled south or west for military reasons, Essex barely strayed further from Court during this time than Essex House in London or Wanstead in Essex."

Misappropriating Wanstead's ownership is only one instance of Daniel's subtle tactic of exploiting the homogeneity of Mountjoy and Essex as a means of addressing one patron while speaking to both. In my Hayward chapter, I suggest that Daniel exploited, in perhaps its earliest literary instantiation, the Bolingbroke-Essex binary in concert with a Blount-Mountjoy homologue that collapses the historical distance in order to underscore the durability and significance of the relationship between Essex and Mountjoy. *The Civil Wars* references Mountjoy throughout: both directly -- as the "muse" (3.126), for instance, who encouraged a "graver [and] sadder" poetic style (1.5) -- and indirectly, through his historical forebears. Daniel recalls "[V]aliant [Sir John] Blunt" (4.34.6), who fought Sir Richard Vernon at Shrewsbury, and his son, "judicious [Sir Walter] Blunt," who counsels Henry on the dangers of insurrection. The political significance of the parallel resides in the fact that both Blounts, who Shakespeare would collapse into a single figure in *1 Henry IV* (see 4.3 and 5.3), are Lancastrians loyal to Bolingbroke. Even the Sir John Blount of the Seventh Book, who follows Edward, Duke of York through the course of the Wars of the Roses, nevertheless shares the salient family trait: "Whereof as chiefe, *Trollop* and *Blunt* excell'd: But, *Trollop* fayld his friends; *Blunt* faithfull held" (7:22.7-8).⁴⁶ The historical Blounts, Daniel implies, were to Bolingbroke what Mountjoy is to Essex (and, by extension, what Daniel is to both): independent, critical, yet ultimately steadfast.

The relationship was, however, more than a literary manifestation of the friendship theories of contemporary courtesy books and educational treatises: Daniel's

⁴⁶ A couple of footnotes place Sir Andrew Trollop and Mountjoy at the battle of "Bloreheath, An reg. 38" (23 Sept 1459), Grosart 265.

poem also explores the political possibilities of the partnership.⁴⁷ Readers of the 1595 *Civil Wars* would have inscribed political analogy onto the numerous Blount references that follow an excursus at the end of Book Two that draws a direct parallel between Essex and Henry, while concurrently linking Essex to Mountjoy. In stanzas 121-31, Daniel seems to suggest that the ambitions of Henry limited the ambitions of Essex, much as the sins of the father -- the “fathers crimes” (129.4) -- are visited upon the son (at this stage, the Hereford genealogy remains implicit⁴⁸). Prefiguring Hayward and Shakespeare, Daniel also clearly sympathizes with Henry’s conflicted choice in the face of Richard’s incompetence, while remaining critical of the moral consequences of his rebellious actions:

And *Lancaster*, indeed I would thy cause,
 Had had as lawfull and as sure a ground,
 As had thy virtues and thy noble heart,
 Ordain’d, and borne for an Imperial part.
 (CW 2:116.5-7)

Imagining “what might have beene, had not this beene so” (131.2), Daniel concocts a fantasy of England spared the Wars of the Roses and “the bloud of thirteene battles fought” (123.1), while underscoring the suggestion made at 116.7 above that, had Henry rested on his earldom rather than seek the throne, his “Imperial” contribution would have surmounted and survived Richard’s incompetence:

So should all that thy sonne and thou had got,

⁴⁷ Sir Thomas Elyot’s *The Boke Named the Governour* was perhaps the most influential source for early modern writers, devoting two long chapters to male friendship. Montaigne and Bacon also wrote essays on the subject, both titled “On Friendship.”

⁴⁸ Essex claimed royal descent through Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, sixth of Edward III’s seven sons, whose second daughter married Henry Plantagenet, Earl of Derby and Hereford.

With glorious praise have still beene in our hand
And that great worthy, last of all thy name,
Had joined the western *Empire* to the same.
(*CW* 2:123.5-8)

That the cogent Daniel is rather stretching logic here – Henry V’s success at Agincourt could hardly have been achieved without his father’s earlier treachery in usurping Richard -- betrays his deeply ambivalent position regarding the deposition, as does the apparently fatalistic tone of the following stanzas on Essex and Mountjoy’s political prospects.

Stanza 126 leaves little doubt as to the identity of the “great worthy, last of all thy name,” another Hereford, though this one the Protestant champion Daniel tasks with pacifying the Turk:

[...] (*O worthy Essex*) whose deare bloud
Reserv’d from these sad times to honour ours,
Shouldst have conducted Armies and now stood
Against the strength of all the *Easterne Powres*.
(*CW* 2:126.1-4)

Like Ben Jonson (and unlike most other writers of the period), Daniel was a rigorous grammarian, and he wrote extensively in *A Defence of Ryme* of the value of “well-measured [by which he meant, well-organized] prosody” (6:64), so the tense slippage in this Essex stanza is noteworthy. As subjunctive migrates through conditional to a future tense, so lost opportunity (“[Thou] shouldst have conducted Armies”) meets with exhortation (“There should thy valiant hand”) to become an expectation of greatness: “All the estates [...] might thee admire.” Historiographically and politically, Daniel has it both ways. Running counter to his damning cycle of historical inevitability, in which “Those acted mischiefes cannot be unwrought” (131.5), is the progressive march of

something akin to atavistic entitlement. If the sins of the father -- or forebear -- cannot be unwrought, they can be transmuted into a tentative prospectus for Essex's political advancement: what "might have been" becomes "what might be." If this marks the limit of Daniel's political optimism, yet in a work shot through with pagan ideas of Fate and Nemesis that, in Arthur Ferguson's words, often "made *The Civil Wars* better tragedy than history,"⁴⁹ the progressivist implications of the Essex stanzas stand proud of the surrounding Pyrrhonism.

Essex is not alone in Daniel's vision of what might be; two men accompany him.

One is Daniel's ostensible patron:

And then my Lord the glorie of my muse
Pure-spirited *Mountjoy*, th'ornament of men,
Hadst had a large and mighty field to use
Thy holie giftes and learned counsels then.
(*CW* 2.128.1-4)

The other, crucially, is Daniel himself, the author who

[...] likewise builded for your great designs
O you two worthies, bewties of our state,
Immortal tombes of unconsuming lines,
To keep your holie deedes inviolate.
(*CW* 2.130.1-4)

In yet another architectural edifice -- an "immortal tombe" that sustains reputations rather than contains them -- Daniel houses the two Earls along with its builder, Daniel himself, controlling and protecting the Essex record.⁵⁰ Five years later, Daniel employed dumb eloquence in the service of self-protection, erasing all thirteen stanzas from the 1599 and

⁴⁹ Arthur B. Ferguson, "The Historical Thought of Samuel Daniel: A Study in Renaissance Ambivalence," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32.2 (1971): 185-202; 198.

⁵⁰ Daniel later reprised this role for the deceased Mountjoy, describing *A Funerall Poeme* as "another Tombe / Made by thy vertues in a safer roome" (1:454-55).

subsequent editions of *The Civil Wars*. Yet, in 1597, his political allegiances must have been abundantly clear to whomever was present in Mountjoy's Oxford rooms.

How much, if at all, Daniel was conscious of sharing his literary agenda with other Essexian authors at this time, particularly with Shakespeare, remains difficult to ascertain, despite a considerable body of scholarship linking the two authors. Most of this work is concerned with attempts to date *Richard II*, due to the "many resemblances, not accidental, in language and imagery and in plot and idea," between Shakespeare's play and the first four books of Daniel's *The Civil Wars*⁵¹ that are not found in the chronicles. Major factual parallels include: Hotspur and Hal being the same age; Hal saving his father from Douglas; Glendower failing to appear at the battle of Shrewsbury; and the physical fragility of the dying Henry IV. Other more dramatically rendered equivalences include the sympathetic relationship between Richard and a mature Isabella (she was historically nine years old); Bolingbroke's leading Richard into London; Richard's personally handing over the crown; and Sir Piers Exton's receiving regicidal hints from Bolingbroke.⁵²

Where literary scholars locate textual echoes as evidence simply that one author has read another,⁵³ historicists such as Michel and Seronsy also see ideological correspondences between Daniel and Shakespeare: a similar tone of moral regret for Bolingbroke's actions; an empathetic fascination with the political savvy required to

⁵¹ Laurence Michel and Cecil C. Seronsy, "Shakespeare's History Plays and Daniel: An Assessment," *Studies in Philology* 52.4 (1955), 551.

⁵² For a complete list of probable and possible correspondences between *Richard II* and *The Civil Wars*, see R.M. Smith, *Froissart and the English Chronicle Play* (New York: Columbia UP, 1915), 143-57

⁵³ See, for instance, Wright, "Daniel's Use of Sources"; and Joan Rees, "Shakespeare's Use of Daniel," *Modern Language Review* 55.1 (1960), 79-82.

manage the fallout from the rebellion.⁵⁴ While Michel and Seronsy broadly interpret these similarities as illustrating “the same general philosophy of history” (559) between Shakespeare and Daniel, such instances are also open to factional interpretation. Both writers, for instance, articulate Henry’s politic advice on the benefits of foreign wars for domestic wellbeing, a position in line with the Essex party’s interventionist policies that were reiterated by Hayward in *Henrie IIII*.⁵⁵ Despite an early piece of editorial misdirection by the Victorian critic R.G. White, who argued for two 1595 editions of *The Civil Wars*, the latter composed following Daniel’s viewing of *Richard II*,⁵⁶ consensus now accepts that Shakespeare’s play was composed a year after Daniel’s poem and that, as Dover Wilson put it, “Shakespeare had his head full of the poem while he was engaged upon the play.”⁵⁷ Although, as I shall discuss later, the circularity of influence would apparently rotate the other way during the course of the following decade, in the mid-1590s the textual evidence suggests that Shakespeare was reading Daniel rather than the other way round.

If we are to discern any authorial influence upon Daniel at this time, I suggest that the most plausible candidate is Edmund Spenser, whose dedicatory sonnet to Essex

⁵⁴ Michel and Seronsy 563-65.

⁵⁵ For the triangulation of influence among Hayward, Shakespeare, and Daniel, see my Hayward chapter, 62-67.

⁵⁶ White’s over-elaborate reading (*Works*, vol.4 [Boston, 1859]), though supported by E.K. Chambers (*William Shakespeare*, 1.351), was successfully refuted after eighty years, by J. Dover Wilson’s argument that, “There are not two editions of *The Civil Wars* in 1595, but two issues with slight typographical differences”; see, *Richard II*, ed. J. Dover Wilson (Cambridge Library Collection, 1939), 64.

⁵⁷ Michel and Seronsy 562. George M. Logan, “Lucan-Daniel-Shakespeare: New Light on the Relation between *the Civil Wars* and *Richard II*,” *Shakespeare Studies* 9 (1976), 121-41, also demonstrates that Daniel’s indebtedness to Lucan’s *Pharsalia* can be traced in Shakespeare’s indebtedness to Daniel.

published with the first three books of the *Faerie Queene* in 1590 succeeded in extending a line of patronage begun by Leicester and Sidney. In the sonnet, Spenser admits that Essex has yet to feature in an allegorical poem whose historical concerns, though recent, still precede the young Earl, but he imagines a time when his Muse, having sung “the last praises of this Faery Queene,” shall “make more famous memory of thine Heroicke parts, such as they beene.”⁵⁸ In a much discussed passage from the third book of that 1590 edition, Merlin offers Britomart a political prophecy predicting the ascension of Elizabeth, a “royall virgin” who would ensure “eternall union / Between nations [...] different afore” (3.49.1-2). Yet even the mythic seer will not foresee the Queen’s death:

There Merlin stayd,
As yet overcomen of the spirites powre,
Or other ghastly spectacle dismayd,
That secretly he saw, yet note discourse.
(*FQ* 3.50.1-4)

As Brian Walsh argues, Merlin’s “dismayd” silence is both “an acknowledgment of authorial limits” and an implicit critique of the Queen’s “inability to secure long-term stability for her people.”⁵⁹ To encompass the death of a monarch, even in literature, was to flirt with treason, yet by 1590 Spenser was daring to imagine a post-Elizabethan England in which a hero stands in for an absent ruler, at least overseas. What Spenser needed was the biographical matter that Essex duly supplied when, in 1591, he went to

⁵⁸ Edmund Spenser’s *The Fairie Queene*, ed. A.C Hamilton (London: Longman, 1977), 741.

⁵⁹ See Brian Walsh, “‘Deep Prescience’: Succession and the Politics of Prophecy in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*.” *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 23 (2010), 63-64. Walsh perceives a similar “backhanded compliment” in Robert Greene’s 1591 play, whose prophetic “brazen head,” in a three-part pronouncement, closes off the future entirely: “time is,” “time was,” and “time is past” (9.53, 64, 73).

the aid of Henri IV of France and, at the Siege of Rouen, lost a brother but won a reputation.

Although Spenser's Irish master Lord Grey likely inspired the heroic Artegall of the eleventh canto of Book 5,⁶⁰ written circa 1596, Ray Heffner makes a compelling case that in stanzas 43-65 Artegall metamorphoses into the Essex who stood shoulder-to-shoulder with Henri at Rouen five years earlier.⁶¹ In coming to the defense of Sir Burbon (Henri's ducal name) and his lady Flourdelis (France) as they flee the "rude rout" (47.2) of the Catholic League, Artegall acts authoritatively in supporting the Huguenot defender who had pragmatically thrown away his Protestant shield to assume the French throne, much as Essex stood firm against Elizabeth and Burghley's determination to abandon Henri: "Sir *Artegall*, albe he earst did wyte / [Burbon's] wavering mind, yet to his aide agreed" (57.5-6). Heffner argues that Spenser embeds a glamorous past adventure within the canto's presiding quest to save Irena, or Ireland, so as to "make a stronger bid for the Earl's favor and patronage," while refocusing Essex's attention onto the Irish question.⁶² More than a roving ambassador (and far more powerful), Artegall-Essex, accompanied by Talus, his one-man army with an "yron flayle" (59.4), unilaterally solves one foreign crisis to the east before heading west to rescue Irena.

Whether or not Daniel had access to Book Five of *The Faerie Queene* in manuscript, the parallel between Spenser's allegory and Daniel's historiography, especially with regard to their imagined roles for Essex in a post-Elizabethan landscape,

⁶⁰ Edwin Greenlaw first connected Artegall to Grey in *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1932), 347-70.

⁶¹ Ray Heffner, "Essex and Book V of *The Fairie Queene*," *English Literary History* 3.1 (1936), 67-82.

⁶² Heffner 77.

is striking. That is to say, the two writers were on the same page politically if not necessarily materially. Where Spenser imagines Essex reclaiming Ireland for Protestantism, Daniel charges his patron with the rather more ambitious task of converting the entire pagan world:

There should thy valiant hand perform'd that good
Against the barbarisme that all devoures,
That all the states of the redeemed *Earth*
Might thee admire and glorify thy birth.
(*CW* 2:126.5-8)

Moreover, Daniel conceives “Pure-spirited Mountjoy” as Essex’s deputy on the ground:

Whole landes and provinces should not excuse
Thy trusty faith, nor yet sufficient beene
For those great virtues to have ordered
And in a calm obedience governed.
(*CW* 2:128.5-8)

Two years later, in *A Vewe of the Present State of Ireland* (1596), Spenser posited a similar position for Essex when he argued for the need of a Lord Deputy of Ireland who would wield his authority from the English court through a “Lorde Lieutennante” (probably Mountjoy) based in the province. Although, as Rudolf B. Gottfried pointedly remarks, such a title was “usually reserved for a member of the royal family,”⁶³ there is little doubt that Spenser had Essex in mind for the post. Irenius’ nomination of “such an one [...] whom the ey of all Englande is fixed and our last hopes now rest,”⁶⁴ echoes Spenser’s sentiments in *Prothalamion*, written in the same year, in which he dubs the

⁶³ Rudolf B. Gottfried, “Spenser’s *View* and Essex,” *PMLA* 52.3 (1937), 646.

⁶⁴ *A Vewe of the Present State of Ireland*, f.94v, in *The Works of Edmund Spenser*, 10 vols, eds, Edwin Greenlaw, Charles Grosvenor Osgood, Frederick Morgan Padelford, and Ray Heffner, (London: Oxford UP, 1966), 228.

hero of Cadiz, “Great England’s glory and the World’s wide wonder.”⁶⁵ Spenser and Daniel, it seems to me, are testing the limits of Essex’s political status as “leader of the forward school” both in the weakening *Regnum Cecilianum* of Elizabeth’s Privy Council and in an impending Jacobean administration under a self-declared absolutist monarch with a penchant for peace. While Shakespeare and, to a lesser extent, Hayward considered the workability of Essex’s ongoing position *behind* the throne, Daniel and Spenser effectively mitigated the potential threat of Essex’s propinquity to the crown by assigning him the semi-autonomous power of an overseas Viceroy in a proto-colonial new world order.

To answer, then, the questions I posed at the beginning of this section on the inception of *Philotas*, Daniel’s invitation to meet with Essex’s closest intimates in Mountjoy’s Oxford rooms seems to have been entirely logical. Daniel was effectively a houseguest of both Mountjoy and Essex at the time, having chosen the *realpolitik* world of the Essex faction over the esoteric complaint culture of Wilton; he had boldly declared his factional allegiance in print two years earlier in a *Civil Wars* project that he was enlarging in concert, if not in direct collusion, with other major Essexian writers; and he had demonstrated his willingness to confront the increasingly fraught issue of Essex’s political future with balanced, careful, yet ambitious thinking. Above all, he offered a voice of authority and reason within an increasingly belligerent circle. And yet, at the moment the Essex faction most needed a public relations boost, Daniel hesitated, and for three years the *Philotas* project went silent. In the following section I consider the nature of this silence and the possible reasons it came to an end.

⁶⁵ *Edmund Spenser’s Poetry*, ed. Hugh Maclean (New York: Norton, 1982), 146.

1600: Inception

Despite acknowledging its fractured compositional history, scholars still tend to view *Philotas* -- as text or performance piece -- from its *terminus ad quem*, its point of completion. *Philotas*, in other words, is an early Jacobean play, its political interest generated entirely by the analogous trials of Essex and Philotas dramatized in the final two acts. Consequently, little if any speculation exists concerning the play's Elizabethan history - neither the three-year hiatus between 1597-1600, when the project hibernated, nor the circumstances that finally compelled Daniel to put pen to paper. Perhaps, in light of Essex's increasingly sour relations with Elizabeth, Daniel failed to find any "example worthy of note" in the story of the overreaching Greek general who delayed forwarding intelligence of a plot on Alexander's life, confessed under torture, and was executed for treason. Yet if, as G.A. Wilkes suggests, fact proved too close to fiction to make workable factional material,⁶⁶ why would Daniel delay his play when Essex was a public hero, only to begin it when Essex was facing just such accusations of double dealing at court? In his Apology Daniel suggests that he was simply too busy on commissioned work, and was anticipating a time when his "Fortunes would give [him] peace,"⁶⁷ an intriguing statement implying the manifesto nature of a project he later claimed to have finished for financial gain. Daniel was certainly productive during this period, adding a fifth book to his *Civil Wars* while composing two experimental works, the colloquy poem *Musophilus* and the verse epistle *A Letter to Octavia from Marcus Antonius*, all of which were published in 1599 by his long time collaborator Simon Waterson. Yet he was just as

⁶⁶ G.A. Wilkes, "Daniel's *Philotas* and the Essex Case: A Reconsideration," *Modern Language Quarterly* 23.3 (1962), 240.

⁶⁷ Michel 156.

busy in 1600 preparing his first collected works, *The Poetical Essays* (published in 1601), which, along with *Octavia* and *The Civil Wars*, included an enlarged *Rosamond* sequence. Rational excuses cannot explain *Philotas*' delay.

What we can say is that most of Daniel's works from this period appear to be the product of a personal and professional crisis. Full of self-doubt, Daniel seems to be at war with himself, oscillating between notions of engagement and retreat, of maintaining silence and of speaking out, that go to the heart of his political and literary ethics and which clearly shape the early acts of *Philotas*. *Musophilus*, heavily influenced by Montaigne -- "the reflexive, self-probing, revising side of Montaigne"⁶⁸ -- stages a fierce debate between the balanced reasoning of the bookish title character and the fiery passion of Philocosmus (the affix perhaps offers a parallel with Daniel's future dramatic character) in arguments that echo throughout the later play's first scene in which *Philotas*'s Baconian advisor, Chalisthenes, urges caution, restraint, and the politic value of self-effacement.⁶⁹ *Octavia*'s dedication, meanwhile, confirms that Daniel was on the move again, seeking new patronage from Margaret Clifford, the Countess of Cumberland, whose failing marriage to the philandering privateer George Clifford was

⁶⁸ John Pitcher, "Samuel Daniel, Poet and Historian," *ODNB* (Oxford, 2008), online edition.

⁶⁹ Although Plutarch (*Alexander* 52-55) describes how Callisthenes, an historian and nephew of Aristotle, fell from favor and was executed by Alexander, it is possible Daniel drew on Book 3 of George Puttenham's *The Art of English Poesy*. In a chapter dealing with what "generally makes our speech well pleasing and commendable" Puttenham writes: "if Callisthenes had followed and forborne to cross the King's appetite in divers speeches, it had not cost him so deeply as it afterwards did," *The Art of English Poesy: A Critical Edition*, 1589, eds. Frank Whigham and Wayne Rebhorn (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2007), 354. Chalisthenes and *Philotas* therefore occupy the ironic polarities of a tyrannous administration; the one dying for speaking out, the other for remaining silent.

astutely reflected in Octavia's troubled relationship with Mark Antony. Daniel's bid for employment apparently succeeded, and sometime in 1599 he relocated from Wanstead to the Clifford countryseat in Bedford, a position of greater safety but more onerous duties. In a letter to the Lord Keeper, Sir Thomas Egerton, the never-satisfied Daniel bemoans his position as tutor to Margaret's brilliant daughter Lady Anne in terms that ironically prefigure his later theatrical employment: "I have been constrayned to live with Children."⁷⁰ As noted above, Daniel accompanied this physical retreat by deleting Essex, at least in name, from the 1599 *Civil Wars*. The literary evidence (and its absence) suggests that politically, physically, and intellectually Daniel was attempting to distance himself from the endgame developing between Essex and his court rivals, a withdrawal that is articulated in *Philotas*' silence.

We should be wary, however, of interpreting withdrawal as a sign of defeat and silence as the sound of denial. Throughout the 1590s a movement grew among moderate Europeans as a response, in J.H.M. Salmon's words, "to competing religious enthusiasms and to the extension of arbitrary monarchical power."⁷¹ Neostoicism, a fusion of Senecan ethics and Tacitean policy elucidated by the Flemish humanist Justus Lipsius in his 1581 work *De Constantia* would have a profound effect on the English Taciteans, both the translators and their factional readers. In effect, Salmon writes, "Tacitus politicized Senecan philosophy and gave it a cynical bent"; as a result "private prudence and

⁷⁰ Cited in Pitcher, "Samuel Daniel's Letter to Sir Thomas Egerton," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 47.1 (1984), 56.

⁷¹ J.H.M. Salmon, "Stoicism and Roman Example: Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50 (1989), 202.

withdrawal [emerged] as the best policies.”⁷² The allure of Stoic withdrawal, already inherent in the rarified confines of Wilton, increasingly constituted the ideological response of Essexians and post-Essexians out of favor at the Jacobean court who, like ancient Epicureans, threatened to reject centralized government for the sanctuary of the walled gardens of their country estates. “There is liberty in a solitary obscure life,” wrote a defiantly pessimistic Sir Charles Cornwallis, “more precious than any commodity that rests in the hands of those strivers for the world, and that is mine.”⁷³ Tactical retreat, especially under the guise of feigned illness, could be both perspicacious and sinister. The ever-pragmatic George Puttenham admired wise courtiers who, “by sequestering themselves for a time from the court, [would] be able the freelier and clearer to discern the factions and state of the court and of all the world besides.”⁷⁴ Essex was a master of the well-timed malady. The Robert Doleman affair left him “wan and pale [and] so ill of the gout in his hands, arms, knees, and toes that his pains makes him pitifully groan”- which, as Hammer points out, is odd considering he had known of Doleman’s *A Conference about the next Succession* “for some months.”⁷⁵ A hypochondriac by disposition, Essex also possessed the healthy instincts of a natural politician.

The inherent theatricality of these politic retreats seems to have fascinated Shakespeare; his second tetralogy, for instance, articulates conflicting interpretations of

⁷² Salmon 224.

⁷³ Charles Cornwallis, *Essayes* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1946), 234. For a good example of Cornwallis’ Tacitean historiography, see *A Discourse of the Most Illustrious Prince, Henry, Late Prince of Wales* (London, 1626).

⁷⁴ Puttenham 380.

⁷⁵ Essex’s illness, recorded in the Sidney Papers, 1.357, is cited in G.B. Harrison, *The Elizabethan Journals: Being a Record of Those Things Most Talked of During the Years 1591-1603* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1955), 2.57. For Hammer’s skepticism, see *Polarization* 145.

Northumberland's absence from Shrewsbury, variously reported as a fateful infirmity by the Archbishop of York (*1 Henry IV* 4.4.16-17) and as a "crafty sick[ness]" by Rumour (*2 Henry IV*, Induction 36-37). But another play of the period, a comedy that stages exile as pastoral retreat, offers an altogether more productive model for Essex. Scholars have long suspected that the exiled court of *As You Like It* (1598) alludes to Essex's various aristocratic withdrawals in the face of royal neglect. Most recently, Juliet Dusinberre conjectures that the play was first performed at the Shrove Tuesday celebrations held at Richmond Palace in February 1599.⁷⁶ During this period an increasingly disenfranchised Essex chafed as the Queen delayed over whether to appoint him commander of the Irish expedition, a post he had previously considered another form of exile, but which now seemed to offer political salvation. If Dusinberre is right then the atmosphere in the Great Hall would have been electric as Elizabeth, flanked by the Cecil and Essex factions, witnessed a drama in which a young man (Orlando) offers to strike the ruler of his declining house, and the dissident court led by a Duke "too disputable" (2.5.32) even for Jaques's company debates the value of exile, while Amiens carols of one "*Who doth ambition shun, / And loves to live i'th'sun*" (2.5.35-36). For all its political acuity, however, Shakespeare's play offers a recuperative retreat dappled in sunshine and the spirit of reconciliation, and a text littered with allusions to various Essex artistic protégés -- the miniaturist Nicholas Hilliard (2.7.198), the fencer Vincentio Saviolo (5.4.89-101), and the composer of the setting to "It was a lover and his lass," Thomas Morley.⁷⁷ As

⁷⁶ *As You Like It*, ed. Juliet Dusinberre, Arden 3 (London: Thompson, 2006), 72-77.

⁷⁷ For Essex and Hilliard's childhood association as Protestant exiles in Geneva, see Roy Strong, "Queen Elizabeth, the Earl of Essex and Nicholas Hilliard," *The*

such, *As You Like It* perhaps encouraged Essex to set aside his increasingly improbable ambitions as a military statesman in order to focus on his alternative role as patron of the arts.

Throughout Daniel's works, the friction between participation and retreat is endemic and unresolved: nowhere do we find the kind of Edenic harmony offered by Shakespeare's Forest of Arden. And nowhere is the politics of withdrawal -- always tactical, always conflicted -- more conspicuous than in the early acts of *Philotas*, which, from its opening lines, engages directly with the semantics of retreat: "Make thy selfe lesse *Philotas* than thou art. / What meanes my father thus to write to me?" (1.1.1-2). *Philotas* reads his father's advice literally, imagining the space created by his physical displacement into which others can climb: "Shall I let goe the hold I have of grace, [...] / To suffer others mount into my place / And from below, looke up to where I stood?" (1.1.5-8). Chalisthenes, however, argues that the advice is figurative and politic: "Your father meanes not you should yeeld in place, / But in your popular dependences" (1.1.20-21). Although *Philotas*' politically motivated ostentation has its source in Plutarch ("Sonne I pray thee be more humble and lowly"⁷⁸), the phrase "popular dependencies" chimes with earlier locutions we have encountered -- Henry accusing Hal of being "enfeoffed [...] to popularity" (*1 Henry IV*, 3.2.69); Hayward describing Henry's

Burlington Magazine 101.673 (1959), 145-49. Saviolo's fencing manual *Of Honor and Honourable Quarrels*, (London, 1595) dedicated to Essex "the English Achilles," contains the "Discourse [...] touching the giving and receiving of the Lie," ("The 2 Booke," R4^r) which likely furnished Touchstone with his "quarrel upon the seventh cause" (5.4.49-50). Dusinberre (76) points out that Morley had previously worked on the Bacon/Essex masque *Of Love and Self-Love*, and appears to play on Elizabeth's endearment to Essex as her "night star" by describing his "great patron" as a "day star" in his preface to *A Plain and Easy Introduction to Practical Music* (1597).

⁷⁸ Plutarch's *Lives* 4:354.

“complements of popular behavior,” which the “severer sort accompt abasement” (*Henrie IIII*, 71); Bacon advising Essex to “speak against popularity [...] but to go on in [his] honourable commonwealth courses”⁷⁹ – that generate yet another cluster of Essexian “buggeswords” alerting the audience to the factional subtext. And while most of the plot points and central themes derive from historical sources, the debate over physical and political retreat is peculiar to Daniel and to the immediate concerns of the Essex faction.

In the year prior to *Philotas*, Essex suffered numerous quasi-banishments and semi-imprisonments: detained in York House from September 1599, privately censured (though not tried) by the Privy Council in November, placed under the “protection” of Sir Richard Berkeley at Essex House from March 1600, Essex was finally tried for high treason on 5 June, only to be allowed to retreat to his wife’s childhood home at Barn Elms to the west of London in July,⁸⁰ before gaining complete physical liberty on August 26. In a bizarre reversal, the authorities effectively (and perhaps consciously) replaced Essex’s “anomalous status as an uncondemned detainee in his own house” with the identity of a condemned free agent, at large and attracting dissidents.⁸¹ In reality, however, Essex’s movements were extremely limited. Banished from court, his political career in ruins, yet saddled with massive debts, he could not afford to retire quietly, and as he hung round London waiting to hear whether Elizabeth would renew his crucial

⁷⁹ Spedding 9:44.

⁸⁰ Essex gained little material benefit from the Walsingham match other than £300 and Barn Elms; see Hammer, *Polarization*, 284.

⁸¹ All quotes in the historical analysis of Essex’s final months are from Hammer’s article, “Devereux, Robert, Second Earl of Essex (1565–1601),” *ODNB*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004), online edition.

lease on sweet wines he also learned of the ultimate betrayal of his political ambitions: Cecil's initiation of peace talks with Spain. According to Hammer, doubts as to how to proceed generated a growing schism both within Essex's own psyche and among his supporters. While moderates urged "repentance and self-abasement" accompanied by a total withdrawal from factional politics, die-hard Essexians led by Southampton and Cuffe demanded action against their court rivals, encouraging Essex into underhand dealings with James in Scotland and Mountjoy in Ireland, where he had assumed command of the English forces.

The "battle for, and within, Essex's mind" between engagement and retreat runs throughout the early acts of *Philotas*.⁸² Contrary to his sources' representations of a general at the height of his power and "next unto Alexander [...] the most vallientest man alive,"⁸³ Daniel's Philotas is already under threat of some unnamed disgrace, his monarch suspicious, his enemies gathering, his soldiers gaining nothing from "all these warres, / But empty age, and bodies charged with scarres" (1.1.81-82). Philotas counters Chalcisthenes' dismissal of his military record -- "These times want not men to supply the State" (1.1.129) -- by affirming his confidence in loyal overseas forces under his father: "I fear not whilst *Parmenios* forces stand" (1.1.130). Yet just as Mountjoy prevaricated from across the Irish Sea, so Chalcisthenes notes that, "Water far off quenches not fire neere hand" (1.1.131), and he metaphorizes the treacherous nature of the coastal terrain to warn, "doe not build upon such sand" (1.1.133). In the second act Ephestion and Craterus' suggestion that Alexander should "withdraw [his] beames of favour" (2.1.514)

⁸² Hammer, *ODNB*.

⁸³ *Plutarch's 'Lives'* 4:354.

from Philotas is perhaps a barely concealed reference to the expired wine license, a live issue at the time of the scene's composition (the renewal was not denied until 30 October 1600). Alexander's anxiety about the "sullivation" that might ensue (he, or Daniel, seems fearful to utter the more common term "insurrection") and Craterus' assurance that advising his king of the need to "repress a spirit so mutinous" (2.1.540) is born of "conscience" rather than "private grudge" (2.1.527), seems to re-imagine in dramatic form the kind of conversations that must have gone on between a circumspect and still-reluctant Elizabeth and the quietly ruthless Cecil.

Such uncharacteristically blatant analogizing suggests that Daniel was writing under pressure and responding to particular crises. I suggest, therefore, that we can date the inception of *Philotas* to the period shortly following Essex's release -- mid-September 1600 certainly fits with Daniel's own dating of "neere half a yeare before the late Tragedy or ours" (which could refer either to the rebellion of 7 February or to Essex's execution two weeks later) -- when debate raged within the faction as to the best course of action, and an anxious government, as if attending to Craterus' advice, began closely monitoring comings and goings at Essex House:

Your grace should call a more sufficient guard
And on his actions set such wary eyes,
As may thereof take speciall good regard;
And who to him have the most free access.
(*Philotas* 2.1.555-58)

Given Chalcidius' warnings about unfaithful friends, Craterus' exploitation of state surveillance, and a Machiavellian King who counsels his counselors, "But yet we must beare faire, lest he should know / That we suspect what his affections are" (2.1.566-67), there seems little doubt that Daniel, favoring the moderate position, offers only one

rational tactic for the General and his supporters: disengage and disappear. *Philotas*' early acts hardly touch on the Apology's central defense that the play's inoffensive analysis of ambition was "the perpetuall subject of books and Tragedies" (156), focusing instead on the perils of mismanaging the *accusation* of ambition.

Arguably, then, *Philotas* is aimed more at Essex's close confederates than at Essex himself, a reading that accords with Daniel's claim that the play was intended for performance "in Bath by certaine Gentlemens sonnes as a private recreation" (156). Pitcher proposes the Kelston home of Sir John Harrington, the Queen's "saucy" godson and close confederate of Essex, as the likely venue for this proposed performance,⁸⁴ although, lacking firm evidence, we can only surmise that this second "airing" of *Philotas*, like its inauguration in Oxford, was a specifically factional event. Whatever the venue, Daniel seems to have been the prime mover in the venture, openly admitting to having shown his play to "many witsnesse[s]," despite its unfinished state, and he was prepared to undertake a midwinter journey from Bedford or London to Bath for a private "recreation" in front of what Janet Clare terms "a specialized audience."⁸⁵ Clearly,

⁸⁴ Gazzard considers Pitcher's hypothesis -- which he cites as a "Personal communication" -- as "plausible" (428). Harrington's possible involvement in the *Philotas* story is certainly intriguing. Basking in the notoriety generated by his 1596 political allegory, *A New Discourse of a Stale Subject, called the Metamorphosis of Ajax* (which plays on his new invention, the flush toilet), Harrington was *au fait* with contentious analogies and would have made a sound host. He was also close enough to Essex to have accompanied his commander's risky return from Ireland the previous September. Harrington presumably hoped to intercede between Essex and his frequently indulgent godmother, a tactic that obviously failed. Banished from court, Harrington never fully recovered his former position. See Jason Scott-Warren, "Harrington, Sir John (*bap.* 1560, *d.* 1612)," in *ODNB*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004), online edition.

⁸⁵ Janet Clare, *Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority': Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990), 127.

Philotas was intended as more than a festive entertainment, especially when staged in close proximity to the public performance of the long-finished play of *Richard II* for a similarly “specialized” audience barely two months later.

If, as I believe, the parallels between Daniel’s belated fiction, the faction’s developing crisis in the autumn of 1600, and the proposed venue of the closet performance that Christmas, offer a persuasive body of evidence confirming *Philotas*’ strategic designs in the three acts preceding the Jacobean text, I am less certain than Michel or Gazzard as to Daniel’s judgmental opinion of *Philotas*-Essex.⁸⁶ Both the source material and the play depict an inherent paradox that complicates Daniel’s critical position toward Essex in such a way as to reconfigure factional debate in the terms of artistic self-interrogation. In commencing *Philotas*, Daniel effectively re-engages with the Essex circle in order to urge their disengagement; put another way, he finds his voice in order to counsel silence. And his choice of literary vehicle suggests that he was conscious of the paradox. He articulates the inner conflict between the instinct to take cover and the impulse to speak out in the appropriately conflicted medium of closet drama, a form that consistently hedges and privatizes its public pronouncements while making a conspiracy of its private auditors.⁸⁷ And he reorganizes the fragments of orality and secrecy scattered disparately throughout his classical sources into a cohesive pattern that foregrounds and interrogates the moral efficacy of a poetic trope Daniel had long

⁸⁶ For a reading of the first three acts as unambiguously critical of Essex, see Michel 63 and Gazzard 338.

⁸⁷ For a discussion of the conflicted nature between public and private pronouncement in closet drama, see Barry Weller and Margaret Ferguson’s introduction to Elizabeth Cary’s *Tragedy of Mariam, The Fair Queen of Jewry* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1994), 26-30, a play heavily indebted to Daniel’s *Philotas*.

valorized: “the *topos* of silent rhetoric.”⁸⁸ Every strand of *Philotas*’ sourced main plot, and of the largely invented subplot featuring two enamored Persian courtesans, confronts the issue of volubility -- its value and its hazards. As Pitcher points out, classical authors had long deliberated the various implications of silence in the story of Alexander and his moral decline: from the breaking of a protracted silence by the Oracle of Ammon to declare the Greek boy-soldier a universal man-god, to the subsequent silence of his Macedonian countrymen as they conspired to test the limits of Alexander’s divinity.⁸⁹ Daniel, however, seems determined to test the ethical and political limits of the issue at every opportunity: *Philotas* talks incessantly about not talking.

Daniel’s Argument, which precedes the text but which followed the troubled performance, promises a straightforward drama of leaky subjects betraying various confidences to an all-seeing (or -hearing) government. What we actually get is more complicated. In the long first scene, Chalcisthenes’ advice that, “In Courts men longest live, and keepe their ranks, / By taking injuries, and giving thanks” (1.1.61-62), contends with *Philotas*’ counter-complaint that, “These vaine discursive Book-men / [...] thinke we can command our harts to lie / Out of their place”(1.1.156-64). The former is wise yet duplicitous, the latter vain but honest, and it is unclear who attains the moral high ground. Following this opening dialogue, the main plot is activated when Celabinus passes to *Philotas* his knowledge of a plot by the nobility on Alexander’s life, the details of which had been related to his brother Nichomachus by arch-conspirator Dymnus. Perhaps exploiting a long-standing distrust among English humanists of the “Greek

⁸⁸ Sukic 113.

⁸⁹ Pitcher, “Daniel and the Authorities” 113-14.

character,” Daniel draws relations between Dymnus and Nichomachus that are ambivalent and homoerotically charged.⁹⁰ Dymnus seems compelled to share his secret because his “heart hath no locke shut against” his companion (1.1.200), while Nichomachus, his “Youth and desire drawne with a love to know” (1.1.209-10), cannot resist the allure of secret knowledge. In the fading afterglow of revelation, Nichomachus regrets his wanton auralty and loudly trumps his promise of secrecy with the oath of allegiance: “My falsehood here is truth, / And I must tell” (1.1.221-22). Faced with Dymnus’s threat to “sacrifice / To silence and their cause, his dearest bloud” (1.1. 241-42), Nichomachus instead turns to entrapment, trading his silence for the names of the other conspirators. Released, he promptly informs his brother, who passes the information up the chain of command. The scene ends with Philotas vaguely promising, “to finde time t’acquaint the king therewith” (1.2.266), an obligation he fails to uphold with fatal results. In one scene, then, Daniel neatly compresses the conflict between oral/aural engagement and withdrawal: between the individual’s need to maintain confidentiality in the face of state surveillance and the state’s dependence upon prolix conspirators betraying their private treasons; between the desire to listen and the requirement to inform; between the refusal to pretend and the willingness to perform. The scene raises further issues concerning accessibility and the channeling of information toward the center -- how to acquire information, when to act upon it, and how to pass it on -- all of which place as much responsibility on the listener as on the speaker.

⁹⁰ For a consideration of the pervasive dislike of the Greek character among English humanists nurtured on Roman texts, see John Channing Briggs, “Chapman's *Seaven Bookes of the Iliades*: Mirror for Essex,” *Studies in English Literature* 21.1 (1981), 60-62.

However, Daniel soon undermines any notion that the state channels of communication are effective or pristine. Immediately after Nichomachus' aural licentiousness and easy duplicity, an exchange occurs between the two "Curtizans" that bears out Chalisthenes' anxiety over loose tongues. In 2.1, Philotas's mistress Antigona, riled by Thais's romantic cynicism, relates her lover's boast that the "yong-man" (as Philotas persistently disparages Alexander) owes everything to the blood and skill of others, especially to Alexander's father Parmenio. "Times have their change, we must not still be led," declares Philotas, adding ominously, "And sweet *Antigona*, thou mayst one day / Yet blesse the houre t'have knowne *Philotas* bed" (1.2.321-23). In the privacy of her own soliloquy, Thais condemns her own sex, arguing that women are both leaks and leaches, as incapable of keeping intimacies as they are skilled at siphoning secrets from men hardened even to the threat of torture: "The smoake of their ambition must have vent / And out it comes what racks should not reveale" (1.2.355). Thais then makes us confidants to her intention to repeat Antigona's words to Craterus, pillow talk puffed into state conspiracy, in revenge of a prior rejection by Philotas and in hope of future gain from Craterus.

Against this backdrop of a whispering world where candor is a form of duplicity, deserted friends are more dangerous than close enemies, and language governed by love "begets a confidence of secrecy" (1.2.369), Philotas' decision to withhold his knowledge of the plot might well be considered astute caution rather than treasonous negligence. He confidently defends his silence by arguing that the unproven "brabble of two wanton youthes" (3.1.855), Dymnus and Nichomachus, would devastate the reputations of the ten "ancient and most loyall servitours" (3.1.850) named in the pact, and implies that the

rumor might be little more than misinformation designed to heap scorn upon himself as a malicious accuser, an egotistical yet plausible premise. Nor is he ever directly implicated in the plot, his name absent from the roster of conspirators revealed by Dymnus, who commits suicide before he can be interrogated. On the other hand, Philotas is twice implored by Celabinus to inform Alexander of the plot, admits to having ample opportunity to do so despite earlier bemoaning the fact that he's lost the king's confidence (2.2.4), and will ultimately confess his treason, though under the torture ordered by Craterus (4.2.2030), implicating numerous friends in the process (as Essex would do). The fact is that the case against Philotas is never proven one way or another because the case is not the real issue: in this courtroom drama, the evidence rather than the actors is on trial. *Philotas* "is a lawyer's play," writes Pitcher, "in which the reader is encouraged to weigh what is said strictly as evidence, considering the quality of proof and likelihood as much as the quality of the person who delivered the speech."⁹¹

Although Pitcher believes that the dialectic structure of the play diminishes the psychological interactions of its characters, for this study the drama lies in what *Philotas* reveals about the psychology of its playwright. Three years of silence, during which Daniel watched the Essex faction unravel, are suddenly shattered by three acts of a supposedly closet drama that vociferously debates the eloquence of dumbness and the dumbness of eloquence. As such, *Philotas* offers an anxious commentary on the secret negotiations between Essex and his close circle following the failed rebellion, giving voice to the numerous quiet spaces where treason might be perceived in a manner that is courageously ostentatious. Daniel is now prepared to raise his own head above the

⁹¹ Pitcher, "Daniel and the Authorities" 117.

parapet in order to counsel others to lower theirs, and in so doing brings that very counsel into question: perhaps engagement, at least at the oral level, is indeed the best form of defense. The silent poet seems on the point of finding his political voice.

In reality, however, Daniel's debate was on the verge of redundancy, a fact that emerges towards the end of the third act. The Chorus of "vulgar [...] Spectators" (1.400-1) that closes the first two acts operates like a government mouthpiece refashioning preceding events into acceptable dogma on the dangers of those who "climbe but up to misery" (2.740). Yet the third Chorus turns against the administration so dramatically -- roundly condemning Alexander's advisors as "these great men [who] cloath their private hate / In those faire colours of the publicke good" (3.1110-111) -- that, in order to maintain his schismatic reading of the play, Michel is compelled to suggest that the choric closure actually marks the beginning of the 1604 pro-Essex text rather than concluding the 1600 inception.⁹² Yet my reading of the first three acts as strategically supportive of the Essex faction negates the need for such textual gymnastics; the third Chorus amplifies rather than reverses the preceding dramatic tone. Moreover, while Daniel's Apology blames the play's "intermittence" on his printer's importunity, it seems far more likely that the executioner's axe rather than a literary deadline prematurely ended the lives of both Essex and *Philotas*. Reflecting the downward spiral of events during February 1601, the Chorus gloomily concedes defeat for Philotas, whose discontents will be inevitably condemned by the envious as "the greatest rankes of treacheries" (3.1115). While we might expect such closure to be finite for both Philotas

⁹² Michel's contention (63) supporting his theory of an ethically divided text is judged "one of the more desperate features of [his] argument" by Wilkes 236.

and Essex, in the final section of this chapter I consider how, *in memoriam*, both figures enjoyed a remarkable resurrection.

1604: Completion

Even those critics who support an Essexian reading of *Philotas* largely accept Daniel's defense that he completed *Philotas* in the financial and political confusion created by the collapse of the faction. "My necessitie," he bemoans in the letter to Cecil, "hath driven me to do a thing unworthy of mee, and much against my harte, in making the stage the Speaker of my lines" (Michel 37). And it would be easy to characterize Daniel's theatrical experience as an uneasy relationship sustained solely by economic imperatives. Daniel first came into contact with the semi-public theater through the efforts of Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford (an intimate of the Sidney-Essex circle, and closest friend of Penelope Rich, Essex's sister) in an effort to win him the much-needed patronage of the new Queen Anne of Denmark, to whom he was introduced on James's royal progress through England in September 1603. On the success of this meeting Daniel was commissioned to write a masque, *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, which was performed on 8 January 1604 at Hampton Court.⁹³ Although Ben Jonson derided the piece as outmoded, Daniel's dramaturgical efforts reaped dividends; the following month he was employed as Licenser of plays for the newly formed Children of the Queen's Revels.

⁹³ In his dedication to Lucy Russell, Daniel feigns shock at the "unmannerly presumption of an indiscreet Printer who, without warrant, hath divulged the late shewe at court" (Grosart 5:187), though he presumably received payment for the publication.

Daniel retained his sinecure for barely a year, however, running afoul of the Revels office by licensing a cluster of contentious plays, including Marston's *The Dutch Courtesan* and *Eastward Ho!* (this latter play landed Jonson and Chapman in jail complaining that their fellow collaborator, Marston again, was the real culprit), along with Daniel's own play, *Philotas*. Pitcher maintains that Daniel was guilty of little more than negligence and the studied unprofessionalism of a determined amateur, and that he effectively received payment for a job "he couldn't bring himself to do with any care."⁹⁴ In her history of the Children of the Queen's Revels, Lucy Munro assigns similarly pecuniary motives to the licensing of *Philotas*, suggesting that, "rather than being commissioned by the company's shareholders, [the play] may have been forced upon them by their financially challenged licensor."⁹⁵ Both Pitcher and Munro de-factionalize the completed *Philotas*, figuring it as an opportunistic commercial enterprise that sought to trade on Essex's fading notoriety, their assessments supporting Daniel's admission in the Devonshire letter that his one error had been "indiscretion and misunderstanding of the tyme" (Michel 39). Over-optimistic of the liberality of the new regime, Daniel had merely, if naively, plundered the past -- his past -- prematurely.

However, representing the post-rebellion Daniel as a maudlin "remnant of another time"⁹⁶ resigned to trading on his former glamorous association for financial profit contradicts the current consensus that he went to great lengths to insert into his text "controlled" trial material in an attempt, "if not to exonerate Essex, then at least to stress

⁹⁴ Pitcher, "Samuel Daniel," *ODNB*.

⁹⁵ Munro 140.

⁹⁶ Daniel fashioned this epithet for himself in the dedication "To the Prince" that precedes the 1607 text of *Philotas*; quoted in Michel 98.

the indeterminacy of his guilt.”⁹⁷ Nor does Daniel’s apparent post-1601 cynicism explain the dichotomous relationship between his hegemonic paratexts and his more seditious playtext. When Pitcher writes, “There is no need to consider here the details and reasons for this uncertainty--others have done this already,”⁹⁸ his evasion surely betrays the reality of this critical lacuna; for no one has yet adequately explained why Daniel would complete his play in such a provocative and potentially subversive manner.

Clearly, there is no easy answer to this question. A solitary individual disinclined to partisanship, Daniel’s distaste for literary professionalism also made him averse to forming authorial relationships that might leave their mark in textual homage and allusive traces. “Emulation,” he notes in *A Defence of Ryme*, “is oftentimes a winde but of the worst effect.”⁹⁹ I want to attempt a solution by considering Daniel’s possible interaction with Essex’s history players. Although Jonson and Chapman must have had professional dealings with Daniel as Queen’s licenser in 1604, it seems unlikely that *The Dutch Courtesan* and *Eastward Ho!* aroused factional suspicions; more likely they disquieted the Revels Office with their satiric references to the invasion of Scots courtiers accompanying James across the border -- the “Northern Barbarians,” as Marston called them.¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, textual clues suggest that Daniel, notwithstanding his disdain for the playhouses, was gaining a professional knowledge of some of the Queen’s Revels’ writers, most pertinently Jonson, Chapman, and Marston, along with Shakespeare from

⁹⁷ Gazzard 448.

⁹⁸ Pitcher, “Daniel and the Authorities” 116.

⁹⁹ Grosart 4:55.

¹⁰⁰ For an examination of the issue, see Munro 94-95 and Clare 98-103.

one of the rival men's companies across the water.¹⁰¹ I discern in these relations a deepening concern over anti-absolutism that would shortly bring the crown into conflict with its own civil lawyers and with Parliament.

By examining the protracted relationship between Daniel's *Cleopatra* (revised 1607) and Shakespeare's *Antony & Cleopatra* (1606), several scholars have perceived an inversion in the circularity of influence between Daniel and Shakespeare occurring around the time of the former's employment as Licenser. While broad consensus exists that Shakespeare's play incorporates elements of Daniel's closet drama— whether textual echoes (Michel and Seronsy) or major structural modifications (Arthur M.Z. Norman)¹⁰² -- some dispute remains as to whether Daniel's 1607 rewrite was then shaped by Shakespeare's play. Numerous dramaturgical changes point to Daniel's efforts to transform his chamber piece into something approaching a playable – and watchable – text: three new scenes (1.1, 4.1, and 4.3) flesh out characters previously mentioned only by a Nuncio; new characters are introduced (Dircetus and Diomedes) and others are enlarged (Charmian, Iris, and Gallus). Particularly persuasive are new passages of striking visual detail that suggest Daniel had not only read but seen *Antony and*

¹⁰¹ Whether Jonson's appearance before the Privy Council in late 1605 to answer charges of "popperie and treason" was related to *Sejanus* or to a brawl with his "mortall enemie," the Earl of Northampton; or whether an analogy was suspected between Essex's execution or Walter Raleigh's mistrial, remain open questions. Either way, Jonson's writings were persistently deemed factional. For details, see Clare 111-14.

¹⁰² See Michel and Seronsy, "Shakespeare's History Plays and Daniel, 570-75, and Arthur M.Z. Norman's twin studies, "Daniel's *the Tragedie of Cleopatra* and *Antony and Cleopatra*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 9.1 (1958), 11-18, and "The Tragedie of Cleopatra and the Date of *Antony and Cleopatra*," *Modern Language Review* 54.1 (1959), 1-9. Norman, "Daniel's *the Tragedie of Cleopatra*," 18, argues that Daniel's play, which encapsulates the fifth act of *Antony and Cleopatra*, encouraged Shakespeare's "audacious use of the double climax" that gives Cleopatra her own fifth act tragedy.

Cleopatra. Dircetus' description of Antony hoisted up "in rowles of taffaty," to hang mid-air "showring out his blood" (*Cleopatra* 3. 244, 251), which alludes to the conventions of stage blood, prompts Rees to wonder whether this "passage unmatched by anything else ... for convincing, if melodramatic, narration" is an eyewitness account.¹⁰³

We should be wary, however, of presuming that Daniel could not write graphically from imagination. Even the most closeted dramas contain evocative passages, and Ernest Schanzer makes a strong case that the "only beggeter" of Daniel's rewrites was Mary Pembroke's inspirational companion piece, *Antonius* (1590).¹⁰⁴ Even allowing for the probability that Daniel had begun frequenting the Jacobean theater, at least for the purposes of research, both *Philotas* and *Cleopatra* remain straitjacketed by the Senecan tropes of long soliloquies, Nunciate recall, and stichomythia. I find no evidence that Daniel succumbed to the allure of the public stage; he never conceded any "sort of condescension to the audience," writes George Saintsbury, "The audience was expected to make all the advances."¹⁰⁵ The uncertain relationship between Daniel and Shakespeare, rather than throwing light on Daniel's factional involvement, raises questions about literary reciprocity. Instead, Daniel's connection to the dissenting playwrights he licensed at the Blackfriars in 1604 offers a more tangible relationship, and I suggest that two dramas from this period, Chapman's wildly popular *Bussy d'Ambois* and Jonson's notorious failure *Sejanus*, helped shape the last acts of *Philotas*.

¹⁰³ Jean Rees, "An Elizabethan Eyewitness of *Antony and Cleopatra*?" *Shakespeare Survey* 6 (1953), 93.

¹⁰⁴ Ernest Schanzer, "Daniel's Revision of his *Cleopatra*," *The Review of English Studies* 8.23 (1957), 376. James Loehlin's similar argument that Hayward's "observational quality" in certain passages suggests he had seen *I Henry IV* convinces because Hayward had no known theatrical connections.

¹⁰⁵ Quoted in Grosart 3:ix

While the fury with which Alexander's guards "tear, / With [their] own hands the traitrous paricide" (4.2.1175-76) is Daniel's invention, Philotas' grisly end conjures Lepidus' description of the death of Jonson's ambitious Roman General Sejanus, by the multitude who,

[...] not content
 With what the forward justice of the state,
 Officially had done, with violent rage
 Have rent [his body] limbe from limbe.
(*Sejanus* 5.808-11)¹⁰⁶

Where Jonson's senators appall the audience with an extended report of the torturing of Sejanus' family, Daniel's Nuncius details the terrible procedures inflicted upon Philotas on the rack. Whatever their ambitions, both men received political show trials and subsequent torture sanctioned by a despotic ruler. Daniel had never before written so graphically, nor would he ever again adopt such a Jonsonian tone of outrage. Had Daniel encountered *Sejanus* at the Globe – the inaugural new work for the King's Men -- he would have witnessed the power of the spectators who, like his "Chorus of the vulgar," "see these great men play / Their parts both of obedience and command, / And censure all they do and all they say" (*Philotas* Ch.1.399-402).¹⁰⁷ Had he chosen rather to read Jonson's highly literate first quarto he would have noted the playwright's prefatorial tactic of foregrounding his historiographic integrity via the support of the ancients -- Tacitus, Suetonius, and Seneca -- to counter seditious accusations by those "Moles [and] Swine spoyling, and rooting up the *Muses* Gardens" (*Sejanus*, "To the Readers," 30-33).

¹⁰⁶ Ben Jonson, *Sejanus his Fall*, Q3 (1603) in *Ben Jonson*, 11 vols., eds. C.H. Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford: OUP, 1925-53), vol. 4.

¹⁰⁷ In the 1616 Folio dedication to Lord Aubigny, Jonson concedes that his "poeme [...] suffer'd no lesse violence from our people here, then the subject of it did from the rage of the people of Rome."

Although he apparently replicated *Sejanus*' tactical apparatus when publishing *Philotas* two years later, Daniel did not duplicate every tactic. Reading through Jonson's extensive puff pieces, Daniel would have come across the prolix commendation praising Mountjoy among the enlightened patrons of government. He would also have noted Chapman's brazen acknowledgment of *Sejanus*'s allusive potential. "Nor is this allegory unjustly racked," Chapman writes of the textual enlargements, unable to resist the hint of dark collusion: "And he in storms at sea doth not endure, / Nor in vast deserts, amongst wolves, more danger / Than we."¹⁰⁸ With friends like Chapman, Daniel might have wondered, who needs enemies? Resisting advertisements, Daniel rigidly controls *Philotas*' paratexts.¹⁰⁹

That said, where Jonson displays the art of refined vitriol, Chapman's grandiloquence perhaps encouraged Daniel to push the limits of educated outrage, and I propose that *Philotas* could not have been completed in its current form without the recent success of *Bussy d'Ambois*, the Children of the Queen's Revels' first tragedy and one of the hits of 1603.¹¹⁰ In the titular role he made his own, the eighteen-year-old Nathan Field proved the extent to which boys could not only encapsulate but also comment upon the passions of men. Bussy, like Philotas, is a soldier whose confrontation with a rapidly changing society provoked a painful reassessment of traditional modes of chivalry, virtue, and its political manifestation, *virtù*. And Essex, as

¹⁰⁸ Jonas A. Barish, ed. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1965), 26-28.

¹⁰⁹ For a recent analysis of Daniel's controlling paratexts, see Christina Alt, "Directed Readings: Paratext in *A Game at Chess* and *The Tragedie of Philotas*," *Philological Quarterly* 83.2 (2004), 127-35.

¹¹⁰ Munro details *Bussy*'s first performances, 139.

Richard C. Ide remarks, was the “clearest model for the soldier’s conflict with society and court.”¹¹¹ Both men profess absolute loyalty to their King -- Bussy going so far as to admit he will happily kill any man *but* the King – yet ultimately each articulates a deeper allegiance to personal honor and natural law. Bussy, a dramatic character of megalomaniac dimensions, dares more than Philotas, uttering the infamous axiom: “Who to himself is law, no law doth need, / Offends no law, and is a king indeed” (*Bussy* 2.1.203-4). Yet in his radical wake Philotas fashions a complaint that is no less challenging:

The wrath of Kings, but only blood, suffice,
Yet let me have some thing left that is not ill.
Is there no way to get unto our lives,
But first to have our honour overthrowne?
Alas, though grace of Kings all greatnesse gives,
It cannot give us vertue, that’s our owne.
(Philotas 4.2.1684-90)

Philotas’ defiance in the moment of his condemnation elevates the issue of personal injustice to the status of political philosophy, and his fourth act defiance assumes the grandeur of a heroic individual challenging tyrannical cruelty.

The history of Alexander the Great is rich in material on the dangers of divine monarchy, perhaps too rich for an Essex faction that in 1597 was attempting to reconcile its antipathy to “enlightened” autocrats with their support for a Scottish king in the process of penning his own defense of divinely elected monarchy in *True Law of Free Monarchies* (1598). Daniel’s critique remains theoretical and speculative, and he takes care to displace Greek disapproval of Alexander’s Persian deification onto those who,

¹¹¹ Richard S. Ide, *Possessed with Greatness* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1980), 3.

“idolizing feeble Majestie, / Impiously doe labour all they can / To make the King forget
 he is a man” (1.70-72) – namely, Alexander’s self-interested ministers. By 1604,
 however, theory had rubbed up against a series of brutal realities that appear to have
 radicalized Daniel’s mood. Where previously Craterus had been the puppet master who
 manipulated the downfall of his rival, the blatant show trial of the fourth act is managed
 by and for Alexander, the artificiality of previous displacements underscored when the
 “Great” ruler leaves the stage only to eavesdrop on the hearing. That Alexander had
 previously dismissed the need for evidence, declaring instead that he had read “within
 [Philotas’] face / The map of change, disturbance and unrest” (2.1.465-66) clearly
 undermines judicial process. So too does Ephestion’s willing complicity in translating the
 suspicions of Alexander’s “sacred tongue” into legal judgment (2.1.489-91). Laws are
 brokered and broken on royal whim. But Alexander’s judicial hypocrisy in the final acts
 goes further, rendering the King a tyrant and Philotas a political martyr. “Let him speak
 at large,” Alexander avers, before adding: “So long as you remember he doth hate [...]
 our glory and the state” (4.2.1381-83). Alexander’s need for the trial’s vindication mocks
 his own faith in the oracle of Ammon’s divine sanction, as does his refusal of Philotas’s
 request for the same oracular judgment, which he dismisses as the tactic of “a false and
 faithless man [...] seeking other gods and other men / Whom to forswear” (4.2.1762-
 64). And although the torture to which Philotas finally succumbs is urged by Craterus,
 Alexander again lurks “behind/ A travers, out of sight” (Nuncius 5.2043-44), emerging
 only to offer the heartless judgment on a broken body: “I never thought, a man that had a
 mind / T’attempt so much, had had a heart so weake!” (Nuncius 5.2045-46).

In a strikingly unorthodox move, Daniel then divides the Chorus between Greeks and Persians, not to create a dramatic dialogue, but to expound the hypocritical similitude between enlightened monarchs and heathen despots:

Well, then I see, there is small difference now
Betwixt your state and ours, you civill Greeks,
You great contrivers of free governments,
Whose skill from out the world all countries seeks.
Those whom you call your Kings, are but the same
As are our Sovereigne tyrants of the East.
(Ch. 5.1767-72)

A decade earlier, in *The Civil Wars*, Daniel had imagined Essex civilizing the Orient for the glorification of Elizabeth; now, under James, Philotas-Essex succumbs to the alien innovation of a monarchical divinity that disempowers the people as it enlarges the ruler; for Alexander “hath forgot himselfe and us, and rates / His state above mankind, and ours at naught” (Ch.5.1822-23). Daniel, who was not politically radical, argues for the restitution of specifically aristocratic authority within the governing bodies, especially the law-making institutions. “To do men justice, is the thing that brings, / The greatest majesty on earth to Kings,” states the Greek Chorus, to which the Persians add: “That, by their subalternate ministers / May be perform’d as well, and with more grace” (Ch. 5.1814-17). Reiterating the conventional position of the Essex faction in a post-Essexian political landscape, Daniel’s Chorus of the Vulgar emerges as the play’s sole moral and political arbiter, their diatribes against tyranny fuelled by a sense of aristocratic entitlement and the faint traces of a vestigial proto-republicanism. As Vernon F. Snow argues, the legend of the heroic people’s martyr that Daniel in part instigated formed the nucleus of the aristocratic opposition to the Stuarts and the surprising emergence in the

following decades of the 3rd earl of Essex as commander-in-chief of the parliamentary forces.¹¹²

1605-07: "Speaking into something other than silence"

I contend, then, that Daniel completed *Philotas* as a response to the ongoing concerns of a circle for which he had been literary spokesperson for over a decade. For once in tune with the popular mood, Daniel participated in the extraordinary resurrection of Essex in poems, in ballads, and on stage during the first decade of the seventeenth century¹¹³ -- not as Elizabeth's reclaimed lover, nor simply (though partly) as a nostalgic throwback to an heroic golden age, but as a viable political force, an "umbral" factional leader (to borrow Chapman's term¹¹⁴), more powerful for his intangibility. During his last years, Essex's whirlwind career and quixotic personality had attracted a remarkable diversity of dissenters through his combination of religious tolerance and anti-absolutism: Catholics and Puritans, landed aristocrats and London Puritans, citizens and players. While Essex struggled to shape this disparate group into a cooperative or cohesive faction, *in memoriam* he became a focus for those determined to persuade James to soften his attitude toward customary modes of government and judicial process. I suggest that the completed *Philotas* was Daniel's attempt to exploit this centrifugal energy in that

¹¹² See Vernon F. Snow, "Essex and the Aristocratic Opposition to the Early Stuarts," *Journal of Modern History* 32.3 (1960): 224-33.

¹¹³ Essex's resurrection in print and the popular imagination is the subject of my following chapter on Chapman.

¹¹⁴ In Chapman's *Bussy* the murdered Friar returns as a spectral guide, titled "*Umbra*" in the text.

evanescent period of opportunity and tolerance between the Stuart coronation and the Gunpowder Plot.

I contend also that Daniel was not only aware of the dangers of his project,¹¹⁵ but that he actively sought the King's ear; he made himself audible at the highest level. Daniel's dramaturgy makes little concession to the playhouse audience because *Philotas* was never intended for "public" consumption. Despite Munro's claim that it is the only closet play to be "performed before a paying public,"¹¹⁶ there is no firm evidence of anyone other than the Master of the Revels paying for a performance of *Philotas*. Considering his diffident reputation, the notion that Daniel would consciously dramatize the mistrial of Essex in front of many of its presiding judges while concurrently challenging the King to confront the realities of judicial tyranny might seem a contention too far. Yet out of the ruins of the Essex rebellion, Daniel briefly discovered a new voice, prolixity born of adversity, and explored new means to express it. In "To Henry Wriothesly," one of his verse epistles -- a form that renders private correspondence as public literature -- Daniel celebrates Southampton's release from the Tower not as the recovery of freedom but as the culmination of an exemplary and highly visible confinement: "For ever, by adversities are wrought / The greatest workes of admiration" ("To Henry Wriothesly" 1:217). Extolling Stoic endurance not as private withdrawal but as public act, Daniel was even prepared to enact his new defiance when he personally

¹¹⁵ Robert Pricket's commendation of Essex, alongside his condemnation of Coke, Cecil and others in *Honors Fame in Triumph Riding, or, the Life and Death of the Late Honorable Earle of Essex* (London, 1604), landed him in jail.

¹¹⁶ Munro 139.

delivered his “Panegyricke Congratulatorie” to the new King James I of England at Burleigh Harrington in 1603:

We shall continue one, and be the same
In Law, in Justice, Magistrate and forme,
Thou wilt not touch the fundamental frame
Of their Estate thy Ancestors did forme.
(“Panegyricke” 1:153)

Seasoning eulogy with English history, and making no bones of his and his faction’s anxieties, Daniel imposes explicit demands upon his new monarch.

If, as Seronsy suggests, the “Panegyricke” could have hardly endeared Daniel to the new administration,¹¹⁷ his pointed candor nevertheless made him visible to the counter court developing around Queen Anne and Prince Henry, and he was soon employed as the Queen’s Licenser. Perhaps encouraged to overlook satirical pieces designed to embarrass James by a Queen who, according to the French ambassador, enjoyed “a laugh against her husband,”¹¹⁸ Daniel seized the opportunity to fashion a deeper critique of what he saw as a cultural and political invasion by the alien concept of continental absolutism. Rather than simply attempting to defend his erstwhile patron¹¹⁹ -- an exercise of limited value, as reflected by the play’s consistent ambivalence toward Philotas’ guilt -- Daniel instead co-opted the Essex trial as a dramatic exemplum of the unfolding political battleground between the Privy Chamber and the Houses of Parliament, between the King’s prerogative and the country’s judiciary. The final acts’ recreation of the trial and its political implications render the Philotas analogy increasingly translucent, as the dead Essex is metaphorized, pressed into the service of a

¹¹⁷ Seronsy, *Samuel Daniel* 112.

¹¹⁸ Quoted in Clare 101.

¹¹⁹ See, for example, Gazzard 447.

cause greater than himself. While Philotas's execution renders the play a tragedy, Alexander's tyrannical cruelty shapes Daniel's political ire: "The wrath of Kings doth seldome measure keepe, / Seeking to cure bad parts, they lance too deepe" (5.2.2119-20). Despite a final line urging us "To admire high hills, but live within the plain," Daniel's Chorus, like its author, is anything but Stoical in *Philotas*. Not an innovator by nature, the silent poet became a vocal dissident when threatened with monarchical innovation.

Daniel's factional audibility was as brief as it was courageous, and, suffering from ill health, he retreated to the country to write his prose opus, *The Collection of the History of England* (1612-18). Spanning the Saxon invasions through to the reign of Edward III, Daniel's history, although it references Tacitus in the Preface to the Roman section,¹²⁰ largely replaces politic shaping and selectivity with a modern historiography of minute source analysis and citation in "a prose," writes Pitcher, "as lucid as anything the later seventeenth century could manage."¹²¹ Less exercised by overseas expansion than by ideological incursions, Daniel also found himself out of step with the aggressive Protestant party at court, and *Tethys Festival*, his maritime masque commemorating the 1610 investiture of the Prince of Wales, urged the post-Essex faction forming around Henry to sail close to home waters where "more certaine riches [are] / Than all the *Indies* to *Iberus* brought."¹²² Henry's death two years later effectively severed Daniel's ties with his factional past, initiating his dignified, gradual retreat into rural semi-retirement,

¹²⁰ Grosart 4.89.

¹²¹ Pitcher, *ODNB*.

¹²² *Tethys Festival*, ll.174-75, in Grosart 3:315.

remembered no more as the factional poet or manifesto writer, but as “polished Daniel the Historicke.”¹²³

¹²³ Tailboys Dymoke, *Caltha Poetorum* [The Marigold of the Poets], 1599, cited by Seronsy, *Samuel Daniel* 19.

Chapter Four

“Brave relics of a complete man”: George Chapman and the post-Essex Faction

Introduction

In my preceding chapter, I argued that the last two acts of Daniel’s *Philotas* eschew any pretense at allusive indirection when they ushered the Essex trial centre stage in order to scrutinize the judicial prerogatives of absolute tyranny. In this chapter I consider more deeply the operation of Essex’s posthumous parallelism in the works of innovative playwright and Homeric translator George Chapman (1559-1634). In her analysis of the post-execution ballads and poems that reconfigured Essex as a loyal lover and a self-sacrificing turtledove (a trope explored in Robert Chester’s “Phoenix and the Turtle,” as I discuss below), Alzada Tipton posits that, whereas Essex’s “own efforts to direct interpretations of himself were many times dismally unsuccessful, [...] the reimagining of Essex as turtledove is so successful because it happens after he is dead and cannot interfere.”¹ In the following argument I position Chapman as a chief architect of this posthumous reclamation and re-figuration of the Essex persona in the early Jacobean era.

Befriended by Marlowe, feared by Shakespeare, esteemed by Jonson, revered by James Shirley, and eulogized by Inigo Jones, Chapman enjoyed a remarkably long, if rarely prosperous, career as a dramatic innovator and philosophical poet, whose translations of Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which made John Keats’s poetic speaker feel like “some watcher of the sky / When a new planet swims into his ken,” are considered

¹ "The Transformation of the Earl of Essex: Post-Execution Ballads and 'the Phoenix and the Turtle'," *Studies in Philology* 99.1 (2002), 57-60.

among “the crowning achievement[s] of Elizabethan humanism”² Yet posterity has been less kind to Chapman’s authorship: his plays are rarely performed and his arcane poems are hardly read. His adherence to Platonic mysticism and his morbid obsession with the dead, all too often expressed with bombastic pedantry, provoked John Dryden to call him a “Bully poet” peddling “dwarfish thoughts dressed up in gigantic words,” while G.B. Shaw judged him “an intolerable boaster [who] paraded his knowledge of dead languages [...] and asserted that his dramas were dictated to him by a spirit.”³ Even in his day Chapman’s gothic claims for the “powre of Art” to “Revive the dead, and make the living dye” (*The Shadow of Night*, ll.307-9)⁴ garnered the ridicule of fellow poets, especially Shakespeare, who mocked him as “that affable familiar ghost” in Sonnet 86 and likely represented him as the orotund Holofernes in *Love’s Labour’s Lost*.⁵ Yet amid the ruins of the Essex rebellion, with the faction in disarray and members of its literary circle detained (Hayward), despairing (Daniel), or apostate (Shakespeare), Chapman, I shall argue, found his factional voice and a political function for his phantasmagoria as an Essex revivalist.

² For Keats’s Sonnet 24, “On first looking into Chapman’s Homer,” see *The Poetical Works of John Keats*, ed. Francis T. Palgrave (London: Macmillan, 1884). For Havelock Ellis’ assessment of the Homeric translations, see his *Chapman* (London: Nonesuch Press, 1971), 42.

³ For Dryden’s comments, see “Exact Decorum we must always find,” in *Art of English Poetry*, trans William Soame (London, 1686), 65, and the Dedication of *The Spanish Friar* in *Essays of John Dryden*, ed. W.P. Ker (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921). Shaw’s 1884 address to the “New Shaksper Society” is reproduced in Louis Crompton and Hilayne Cavanaugh, “Shaw’s Lecture on *Troilus and Cressida*,” *The Shaw Review* 14.2 (1971), 52.

⁴ Other than the Homeric translations, all verse quotations are from *The Poems of George Chapman*, ed. Phyllis Brooks Bartlett (New York: MLA, 1941).

⁵ Arthur Acheson, *Shakespeare, Chapman, and 'Sir Thomas More'* (New York: Edmund Byrne Hackett, 1931), 109.

Like Hayward, Chapman came late to the Essex party, dedicating his 1598 *Seaven Books of the Iliad* to the “Achilleian” commander of the imminent Irish expedition; but unlike Hayward, his fidelity to the chivalric ideals of ancient nobility and shared government promoted by the Essex faction endured. As England transitioned into the Stuart era, London filled with Scots, and Parliament wrestled with a new form of absolute government, Chapman intermittently resurrected the spirit of Essex as a productive force in a posthumous Essex faction. Over the following decade, developing his analogy of the disaffected classical warrior of his 1598 *Iliad*, Chapman explored the classical *energeia* of Essex as a necessary, and increasingly ascetic, scourge⁶: a purifying turtledove in “Peristeros,” a short poem contributing to Robert Chester’s *Love’s Martyr* (1601); a purgative whip in Chapman’s first tragedy, *Bussy D’Ambois* (1603); and an oblation to be purified in his only history play, *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron, Marshall of France* (1608).⁷ In the plays, moreover, Chapman expands the Achilles-Essex simile of *The Iliad* to incorporate celebrated figures from contemporary French history, aristocratic warriors who, like Essex, challenged the monarchy at the risk of their lives. Bussy and Byron are neoclassical triforms that are both nostalgic and radical, projecting established factional credos onto current events and future concerns.

⁶ John E. Curran, ““Duke Byron Flows with Adust and Melancholy Choler’: General and Special Character in Chapman’s *Byron* Plays,” *Studies in Philology* 108. 3 (2011), 347, defines *enargeia* as rhetorical liveliness, or “the vividness and immediacy of presence that the orator strives [for].”

⁷ I shall hereafter refer to Chapman’s composite drama as *Byron* and the two halves as the *Conspiracy* and the *Tragedy*. All quotations are from *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron*, ed. John Margeson, The Revels Plays (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1988).

Posthumous Essex dissidence is sustained through a kind of trans-historical and intercultural replication.

Tracing this enriched neoclassical analogy through its ten-year lifecycle helps to define the rationale and aspirations of the post-Essex circle and also confirms its *terminus ad quem* of 1608-9. Chapman's deployment of classical symbolism aggravated an ongoing dispute with Shakespeare, the literary spokesman who, I suggest, was most obviously in the process of extricating himself from the Essex circle. Played out mainly on the Globe and Blackfriars stages, and breathing new life into an apparently moribund faction, this dramatic debate over the value of heroic idealism in the modern state reflected the growing conflict at court between the pacifist policies of James and the Protestant militancy of his son Prince Henry. The intercultural, or neo-French, component of the analogy brings this debate into the immediate sphere of diplomatic relations between Europe's first proponents of enlightened absolutism: James I and Henri IV. Such dangerous topicality, I shall argue, helps to explain the conundrum surrounding the prohibition of *Byron*, an ostensibly anti-factional piece that nevertheless produced a major diplomatic incident in the spring of 1608.

*

Beginning this epic historiographic investigation at its endpoint, in section one of this chapter, "The Byron contention: 'My poore dismembered poems'," I will establish the play's Essexian dissidence with a close reading of the convoluted events leading to the prohibition of the *Byron* production and its subsequent quarto censorship. In "2. Essex and Achilles: 'the lonely man of excellence'," I then go back ten years to assess Chapman's purpose in dedicating his 1598 *Seaven Bookes of the Iliades* to the "now

living Instance of the Achilleian vertues.” Refiguring Essex the Plantagenet pretender as the apotheosis of classical factionalism, Chapman seems to have been alive to moves within the opposition literary wing to elevate Essex’s stature from the local and the domestic to the classical and universal.⁸ Shaping his Homeric translations in much the same way as Daniel had fashioned Essex concerns out of his *Civil Wars*, and exploiting the affective rhetorical power of Homer, whom he termed a “war-poet,”⁹ Chapman entered the debate on overseas Protestant intervention with a tub-thumping call-to-arms.

While the above section deals with Chapman’s belated and brief contact with the active Essex faction, the rest of this chapter investigates his posthumous Essex pieces. In the third section “Alive we lov’d him; dead we love him more,” I position Chapman as a key figure in the efforts of the post-Essex faction that sought to recuperate their fallen leader in anonymous ballads and allegorical poems. In occasional verses appended to one such poem, Robert Chester’s *The Phoenix and the Turtle* (c.1598-1601), in which both writers attempt (with little success) to refigure the fiery Achilleian Essex as a purifying turtledove, Chapman and Shakespeare go head-to-head, their long-standing rivalry aggravated by Shakespeare’s post-rebellion apostasy. In what I conceive to be retaliation against Chapman’s heroic trope, Shakespeare’s bitter and generically problematic play *Troilus and Cressida* (1602) refigures Achilles as a petulant, brooding, and divisive egotist surrounded by Myrmidon renegades. As such, writes Richard C. Ide,

⁸ While Chapman was not the first to dedicate work to Essex as “the English Achilles” -- horticulturalist Hugh Platt and fencing master Vincentio Saviolo had done so in mid-1594 and 1595 -- his analogy was by far the most evolved; for details, see *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. David Bevington, Arden 3 (London: Thomson, 1998), 12.

⁹ “To the Understander,” *Achilles’ Shield* in *Chapman’s Homer*, ed. Allardyce Nicoll, 2 vols (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1967), 1:65.

Shakespeare's play "condemns [...] the 'heroick' genre that idolizes a destructive egomania in the name of heroic individualism."¹⁰ Skeptical, clinical, dispassionate yet somehow disappointed in its unglamorous anti-hero, *Troilus*, also reads like Shakespeare's obituary to Essex.

In burying Essex, however, Shakespeare's acutely Tacitean evisceration of factionalism may have helped to revitalize Chapman. Rather than retreating from the "predominant perturbation" that characterized these heroically enraged figures,¹¹ Chapman sought to understand, even to vindicate, the tragic failure to which a contemporary Achilles like Essex was prone.¹² In "Bussy: the King's scourge," I argue that Chapman promotes the political value (and tragic decline) of the aristocratic warrior in peacetime society by analogizing him to another demigod: Hercules. Drawing on the brutal yet benevolent figure from Seneca's plays *Hercules Furens* and *Hercules Oetaeus*, Chapman's redundant warrior is lured from his rural retreat to cleanse Henry III's rotten court, a task inscribed with martyrdom and self-sacrifice. Set in 1570s France and featuring figures vaguely familiar to London audiences, *Bussy* allows Chapman to exploit a post-Elizabethan nostalgia, in which Essex is remembered as his Queen's beloved ally, while placing its Jacobean critique tantalizingly beyond the reach of the censor. Remodeling the dissident factionalist as a neoclassical scourge, Chapman frames his Bussy-Essex *apologia* as a validating eulogy for a disaffected Blackfriars audience

¹⁰ Richard S. Ide, *Possessed with Greatness* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1980), 17.

¹¹ Chapman describes the heroic figure in his dedication to the earl of Somerset of his translation of *Ulysses*; see *The Poems of George Chapman*, ed. Phyllis Brooks Bartlett (New York: MLA, 1941), 406.

¹² Ide 161.

seeking restitution and political reengagement while retaining its Herculean independence and stoic fortitude.

Five years into James' reign, however, any sense of expectation and entitlement among old Essexians had largely evaporated, to be replaced by the grumblings of Neostoic withdrawal. In the final section, "Byron: scourge of kings," I suggest that Chapman's play, by submitting the Senecan demigod to a brutal Tacitean critique, sounds the faction's retreat. Upon the shifting geo-political sands of an early modern European landscape, the Herculean Byron wobbles like an oversized statue (as, indeed, he is described by England's Councilor; *Conspiracy* 4.1.179-205), his sense of heroic significance exposed as delusional. Yet if Byron's fantasy that he can write his own history defines his personal tragedy, I argue that the exquisite dissection of the enlightened despot in the play's second part locates the play's political *Tragedy*. The decline of the Achilleian warrior in the new political reality offers a telling postmortem on the concurrent reigns of James I and Henri IV and the Machiavellian underpinnings of their paternal absolutism. Hypothesizing that *Byron*'s provocation of a diplomatic incident between the English and French courts was Chapman's conscious effort to invigorate the post-Essex dissidents gathering around Prince Henry and the 3rd earl of Essex (who was currently being feted in France), I conclude that Chapman's requiem for a fallen factional leader, which brought to a close the literary wing of the Essex faction, sounds a muster for a new generation of aristocratic dissidents that proved less wary of confronting their monarch.

1. The *Byron* contention: “My poore dismembered poems”

The “double tragedy” of *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron* dramatizes the events leading up to the execution in July 1602 of Charles de Gontaut, Duc de Biron¹³ and mareschal de France, by the newly enthroned Henri IV, formerly Prince of Navarre. Printed under a single title, though performed as two plays, Chapman’s narrative follows a more or less coherent pattern. Opening with the signing of the Treaty of Vervins, to which Byron is a signatory, the *Conspiracy* charts the heroic soldier’s struggle to acclimatize to peacetime while enjoying the flattery of foreign governments and the growing impatience of his paternally indulgent King. The reconciliation at the climax of the first play is immediately overturned in the *Tragedy*, however, as Byron begins preparing for civil war blithely unaware of Henry’s enveloping entrapment. The result of his show trial is, of course, generically encoded, though Chapman’s closing the play with the traitor’s dying words is perhaps unique in early modern drama.

An awesome commander, Biron was wounded thirty-six times on the field of battle as he helped Henri of Navarre, first of the Bourbons, to fashion a modern French state from the feudal remnants of the Ligue. Blinded by his vainglory, affronted by a perceived lack of respect, and tempted into joining the opportunistic plots of Savoy, Spain, and Austria, Biron was eventually arrested by his King following a revolt of the nobility against the French throne. Yet Biron’s alleged disloyalty, writes Gisele Venet,

¹³ Throughout this chapter I differentiate between the historical Biron and Henri IV and Chapman’s Byron and King Henry.

“did not convince contemporaries any more than it did the historians.”¹⁴ In a period of dynastic and political upheaval, as John Chamberlain noted to Dudley Carleton, mighty men were falling: “Three strange disasters have befallen [the Earls of Gowrie and Essex and the Duc de Biron]; in three neighbour countries in three successive years, and all their cases so intricate that many are unsatisfied [unhappy] in their deaths and will not be persuaded of their undeservings.”¹⁵

While Carleton’s treacherous Essex-Biron parallel of 1602 was necessarily discussed *sub rosa*, we might expect that by the time Chapman brought his dominating but delusional heir to Tamburlaine to the Blackfriars stage six years later the dust of both rebellions would have settled. Yet the government’s retaliation against *Byron* was dramatic. Following a diplomatic complaint by the French ambassador, Antoine de la Boderie, the production was quickly suppressed, three of the boy players imprisoned, Chapman forced to flee to the Duke of Lennox in Scotland, and all playing in the City of London suspended until the theaters agreed in writing to desist from staging contemporary history and topical affairs.¹⁶ The aftershocks were scarcely less violent.

¹⁴ Gisele Venet, “Baroque Space and Time in Chapman’s Tragedy: *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Bryon*,” in *French Essays on Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: “What Would France with Us?”* ed. Jean-Marie Maguin and Michele Williams (Newark: U of Delaware P, 1995), 305.

¹⁵ *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939), 2:162. John Ruthven, 3rd Earl of Gowrie, was accused of attempting to kidnap James VI of Scotland in August 1600 and summarily executed. It was rumored that James owed Ruthven £80,000.

¹⁶ Janet Clare, *‘Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority’: Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990), 140. Clare also notes that the statute was apparently self-enforced until 1617, when Buc was compelled to ban the *Marquis d’Ancre*, an anonymous lost play featuring another French tragic hero who set himself in opposition to the Crown (174).

Initially condemned by James to “beg their bread,”¹⁷ the Children of the Chapel eventually resumed playing, though not at the Blackfriars, which they were compelled to return to Shakespeare’s company the following year. When Chapman attempted to license his plays for publication in late 1608, deputy censor George Buc savaged the manuscript, demanding the expurgation of nearly two acts, which, for the sake of narrative consistency, are then briefly reported in the third person. That the mangled remains of his “poore dismembered poems” (as Chapman describes his play in a dedication to Sir Thomas Walsingham and his son) were retained in the 1625 Q2 suggests that *Byron* had retained its toxicity a full seventeen years after its inception. If, within the terms of this study, Hayward’s *Henrie IIII* brought the greatest personal suffering to its author, *Byron* inflicted the most widespread and sustained damage upon its theatrical milieu.

Understanding the nature of *Byron*’s enduring perniciousness depends upon locating the cause of the prohibition, which scholars generally believe was derived from scandals of the boudoir rather than matters of state. In a partly coded letter to the French Secretary of State of April 8, 1608, de la Boderie boasted that he “had had barred from playing the history of the late Marshal de Biron,” which had given offence for bringing “upon the stage the Queen of France and Mademoiselle de Verneuil [Henri’s long time mistress]. The former, having accosted the latter with very hard words, gave her a box on the ear.”¹⁸ King James, better known for his diplomacy than his decorum, apparently

¹⁷ Quoted in Grace Ioppolo, *Dramatists and Their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare: Jonson, Middleton, and Heywood* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005), 129.

¹⁸ I reference John B. Gabel’s translation in “The Original Version of Chapman’s *Tragedy of Byron*,” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 63.3 (1964), 434.

conceded a breach of etiquette.¹⁹ The opening sentence of de la Boderie's letter alludes, however, to more protracted interference: "About mid-Lent those very actors whom I had had barred from playing the history of the late Marshal de Biron, noting all the court to be away, did so nonetheless, and not only that but introduced into it the Queen and Madame de Verneuil." De la Boderie claims here to have attained an earlier injunction against the players, which was flouted by the actors upon the court's departure for the country and the insult magnified by the addition of an "effeminate war" (*Tragedy* 2.1.56) alluding to a titillating scandal still resonating in 1608. Despite craven efforts to blame his young players -- "I see not myne owne Playes; nor carrie the Actors tongues in my Mouthe"²⁰ -- Chapman seems to have gone out of his way to provoke French displeasure and his own government's censure.²¹ Chapman's motive for these provocations must reside in the cause of this first prohibition.

Following a dedication bemoaning his failure to protect his published play, Chapman's text leaves tell-tale signs pointing to the scenes the censor mutilated. The clash between the Queen and D'Entrague that provoked de la Boderie's second intervention evidently occurred in 2.1 of the *Tragedy* (there is no 2.2). In a scene/act of barely a hundred lines, Cupid introduces a masque featuring the two ladies as Chastity

¹⁹ A.H. Tricomi offers a balanced analysis of James's early reputation at the English court in *Anticourt Drama in England* (Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 1989), 1-12.

²⁰ See the "Dobell letters" (a second document thanks the Earl of Lennox for his shelter during the *Byron* crisis) were discovered by Bertram Dobell in the Folger in 1901 and published in *The Athenaeum*; they are quoted in full by Margeson, Appendix II, B, 278-79.

²¹ Clare, 143, argues that, as the scene was integrated into Chapman's own copy of the script made ready for printing, it was neither improvised by the actors nor foreign to the playwright. De la Boderie also described Chapman as "the principal culprit."

and Liberality, whose “emulation / Begat a jar, which thus was reconciled” (*Tr.* 2.1.18-19). There follows a description of the masque, a stage direction indicating a dance, and a bout of bawdy Italian riddling, before the King reiterates his thanks for “the reconcilment of my queen and mistress” (*Tr.* 2.1.129). The lack of an Act Two header in the quarto, which makes the scene begin *in media res*, implies that the ladies’ war preceded the stage-managed reconciliation, either at the end of the first act or the beginning of the second.

Act four, scene one of the *Conspiracy*, which describes Biron’s historical embassy to London in the summer of 1601, contains the second obviously tampered episode. The meeting between Queen Elizabeth and Biron was fully recorded in Chapman’s primary historical source, his cousin Edward Grimeston’s *A Generall Historie of France* (1608), which he freely translated from Jean de Serres and Pierre Matthieu’s *L’Histoire de France & Des Choses Memorables* (1607).²² In another severely foreshortened scene, what had clearly been intended as a series of direct, highly formalized exchanges between Byron, the Queen, and her Cecilian Councilor, in the text becomes a clumsy recollection between two French noblemen in Paris:

<i>D’Aumont</i>	The Duke of Byron is returned from England And, as they say, was princely entertained, Schooled by the matchless queen there, who I hear Spake most divinely, and would gladly hear Her speech reported.
<i>Crequi</i>	I can gladly speak your turn As one that speaks from others, not from her. (<i>Conspiracy</i> 4.1.1-6)

²² For the close relationship between Chapman and Grimeston, see F.S. Boas, "Edward Grimeston, Translator and Sergeant-at-Arms," *Modern Philology* 3.4 (1906): 395-409.

At one point Crequi, describing the Queen's leave-taking, refers to himself in the third person -- "Then spake she to Crequi and Prince d'Auvergne, / And gave all gracious farewells" (4.1.156-57) -- before abruptly ending the scene on a half-line. Margeson's interpretation of these textual inconsistencies as merely evidence of "hasty and incomplete revision" (n. 4.1.156) does not explain why Chapman would leave the errata in the quartos of both 1608 and 1625, and Clare reads Chapman's "refusal to adapt his plays to the altered context as one of the few available means of protest" he had.²³

By pinpointing the Queen Elizabeth scene as the cause of *Byron*'s first prohibition, Chapman seems to provoke his readers to consider what had rendered it so offensive. Since James's accession, Chapman had been developing a reputation -- and a government record -- as a topical satirist. Arraigned in the Star Chamber for dramatizing a contemporary marital scandal in the lost play *The Old Joiner of Aldgate* in 1603, months later Chapman was lucky to escape charges of "Popperie" by the Privy Council if, as seems probable, he was the "second pen" on Jonson's lost Q1 *Sejanus*.²⁴ Neither playwright was so fortunate two years later when they suffered three months incarceration and the threat of punitive disfigurement for "writing something against the Scots" in *Eastward Ho!*²⁵ However, other sensitive political issues -- such as the Huguenot Henri's politic conversion to Catholicism in 1593 to attain the throne -- and his unholy alliance with Spain in 1598 (*Tr.* 4.1.53-57) survived the cut. The cause of the

²³ Clare 90.

²⁴ For details on Chapman's *Old Joiner* contention, see Clare 90-92; for Jonson, see "To the Reader," l.45, *Sejanus*, ed. Jonas A. Barish (New Haven: Conn: Yale UP, 1965), 28.

²⁵ *Notes of Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden*, ed. David Laing (London: Shakespeare Society, 1842), 20.

English concession to French demands is similarly ambiguous. Margeson's conclusion that the Privy Council "objected to the presentation of Queen Elizabeth in her own person" (that is, upon the stage) is unconvincing.²⁶ Whereas Marie de Medici and Mademoiselle D'Entragues were very much alive in 1608 (thirty-two and twenty-nine years old, respectively), making Chapman's *Tragedy* offensive, if not libelous, there was no law against representing a dead English monarch -- as Thomas Heywood's biographical play of the young Elizabeth, *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, had demonstrated three years earlier. Satirical portraits of Cecil (*Con.* 4.1.157) or allusions to topical *affaires de coeur*, magnified by Chapman's reputation, might have contributed to *Byron*'s reception, but textual evidence suggests that the root cause of the prohibition was more endemic and pervasive, and possessed the capacity to antagonize both the French and the English, just as two aristocratic rebels had done half a decade earlier. The Essex-Byron analogy, in other words, seems the only plausible offender.

In 1897, German scholar Emil Koeppel offered the intriguing hypothesis that the lost *Byron* material included an episode from Matthieu's section of *L'Histoire*, in which the Queen points out to Biron the blackening heads of Essex and his fellow traitors as a warning, a literal *memento mori*, against her brother France's indulgence of overreaching nobles.²⁷ In effect, Elizabeth renders Biron a messenger of his own doom: "Dieu veuille que le Roy mon frère trouve bien de la clemence. Par ma foy, si j'estois on sa place, on

²⁶ Margeson 9.

²⁷ Emil Koeppel, *Quellen-Studien Zu Den Dramen George Chapman's, Philip Massinger's Und John Ford's*, *Von Emil Koeppel* (Strasbourg: K.J. Trubner, 1897), 17-26.

verroit des tetes coupees aussi bien a Paris qu'a Londres."²⁸ Though excited by its dramatic potential, Parrott is skeptical of Koeppel's thesis because Grimeston, the only demonstrable source for *Byron*, does not include the episode in his translation.²⁹ In his *Annales*, William Camden also dismisses the "ridiculous vanity" of the claims of various French historians that Elizabeth kept Essex's skull in her private chamber or displayed it "fastned upon a pole." Camden was well aware, as presumably was Grimeston, that Essex's head had accompanied him into his grave. Yet Camden writes:

This is certaine, that in talking with Biron she sharply accused Essex of ingratitude, rash counsailes, and wilfull disdaining to aske pardon, and wished that the most Christian King would rather use milde severity than carelesse clemency, and cut off the heads of treacherous persons in time, which seeke to worke innovations and disturbe the publike quiet.³⁰

Taken together, Camden and Matthieu's recollections suggest that on both sides of the channel the posthumous Essex was generating an almost mythic afterlife that Chapman could exploit without recourse to the history books.

If Essex's name was censored from the play's offending scenes, his spirit nevertheless infuses the meeting between the English monarch and the haughty nobleman, and textual remnants elsewhere in the text offer clues that in the 1608 performances Elizabeth had indeed drawn her own Essex-Byron parallel. Aside from a reference to the horses of both Essex and Byron dying of grief (*Tragedy* 41.1.133-38), in

²⁸ Matthieu, *L'Histoire de France*, 107. I offer the following translation: "God knows my brother Henry's great clemency. Were I in his place, as many heads would be struck off in Paris as in London."

²⁹ Parrott 592 and 607.

³⁰ William Camden, *Annales Rerum Gestarum Angliae Et Hiberniae Regnante Elizabetha (1615 and 1625)*, Hypertext Critical Edition, ed. Dana F. Sutton (University of California, Irvine: The Philological Museum).

5.3 of the same play, the condemned Byron, desperately seeking clemency from his Chancellor, recalls a conversation from the *Conspiracy*:

The Queen of England
Told me that if the willful Earl of Essex
Had used submission, and but asked her mercy,
She would have given it, past presumption.
(*Tragedy* 5.3.139-43)

While the exchange Byron recalls so graphically is missing, back in Paris D'Aumont poses Crequi a curious *non sequitur*: "When came she to touch of his [Byron's] ambition?" (*Con.* 4.1.122). In response, Crequi supplies a reported speech in which the Queen praises the French nobleman in contrast to "mad-hungry men [who] affect[ing] a kingdom [...] may as well eat hot coals of fire to feed their natural heat" (*Con.* 4.1.138-41). We can only assume that these ravenous men, rendered nameless by the censor, are the conspirators Byron recalls toward the end of the *Tragedy*. It seems highly probable, therefore, that in performance the ever-politic Elizabeth used Essex's memory (rather than a graphic and grotesque *aide memoire*) to critique the ambitious Byron indirectly - much, indeed, as Camden recalled.

Identifying the Essex-Byron parallel as the source of the *Conspiracy*'s prohibition situates *Byron* in a final cluster of plays that engage in a post-Essex dialogue -- along with *Troilus and Cressida* (published in 1608) and *Coriolanus* (written in 1608). And yet endowing the Essex analogy with such enduring oppositional agency creates a conundrum. If the missing material portrays Essex-Byron as a figure of overweening ambition and haughty pride, which encourages most commentators to interpret *Byron* as an orthodox work that pits "a good king" against "a traitor," "champions political conservatism over Machiavellianism," and draws its "ethical hues [...] black and

white,”³¹ then why did the French take offense at the play, and why did the English accede to their request to suppress it? Clearly we are “dealing with something much more complicated -- and politically implicated -- than a pious warning against insurrection,” writes Gunilla Florby. “There is sensitive political matter here, matter that might cost the unwary author a hand or an ear.”³² To understand this matter we must consider both the pretexts and contexts of Chapman’s protracted relations with Essex and his history players. I begin by tracing the roots of Chapman’s factional writing as a relative newcomer to London in the early 1590s, and his adoption and valorization of a new and dangerous political role model: Achilles.

2. Essex and Achilles: “the lonely man of excellence”

According to historicist scholars of the early twentieth century, Chapman’s first association with Essex and his circle of writers, especially with Shakespeare, was equivocal, even antagonistic. In the Edwardian spirit of attribution studies, William Minto and Arthur Acheson went in search of the rival poet of Shakespeare’s Sonnets 78-86 and found Chapman.³³ Where Acheson viewed a conflict of literary interests, with Chapman rivaling Shakespeare for Southampton’s patronage, Muriel Bradbook interpreted the alleged intertextuality between *The Shadow of Night* (1594) and *Love’s*

³¹ Peter Ure, “The Main Outline of Chapman’s Byron,” *Studies in Philology* 47.4 (1950), 588; A.R. Braunmuller, *Natural Fictions: George Chapman’s Major Tragedies* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992), 58; Ennis Rees, *The Tragedies of George Chapman: Renaissance Ethics in Action* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP 1954), 52.

³² Gunilla Florby, *Echoing Texts: George Chapman’s Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron* (Gothenburg: Lund UP, 2004), 18-19,

³³ William Minto, *Characteristics of English Poets from Chaucer to Shirley* (Boston: Ginn & Co, 1889), 325-32, and Arthur Acheson, *Shakespeare, Chapman, and ‘Sir Thomas More’* (New York: Edmund Byrne Hackett, 1931).

Labour's Lost (1595) as one skirmish in a protracted war between opposing court factions coalescing around Sir Walter Raleigh and Essex, with the two playwrights as "rival poet[s] of the camp[s]." ³⁴ Although the "School of Night" hypothesis (which I discuss more fully in the Introduction and Shakespeare chapter) has fallen from critical favor in recent years, Bradbrook is probably correct in imagining that Chapman, at thirty-three a relatively late newcomer on the London literary scene, "fixed his hopes on the learned group clustered round Sir Walter Raleigh." ³⁵

Yet, reclusive by nature and esoteric by inclination, Chapman shared none of the humanist or pedagogical concerns of the other Essex writers. In his dedication to *Ovid's Banquet of Sence* (1596), Chapman defends his self-consciously abstruse style -- "Mineralls are digd out of the bowels of the earth, not found in the superficies and dust of it" -- and, disdaining the "prophane multitude," consecrates his "strange Poems to those searching spirits, whom learning hath made noble, and nobilite sacred." ³⁶ While *The Shadow of Night* introduces the ideological trope that will evolve through Chapman's engagement with the Essex faction, namely his desire to release the scourge of Hercules upon Catholic Europe, ³⁷ the poem largely rejects the concerns of *realpolitik* in favor of the politics of selfhood and interiority: "The mind hath in her selfe a deity" (*Shadow*, "Cynthiam" l. 444). Where Hayward pens Essex a practical guide to self-presentation, the

³⁴ M.C. Bradbrook, *The School of Night* (Cambridge: CUP, 1936), 23.

³⁵ M.C. Bradbrook, *George Chapman, Writers & Their Work* (Reading: Longmans, 1977), 10. For an account of Chapman's pre-literary life, see Mark Eccles, "Chapman's Early Years," *Studies in Philology* 43.2 (1946), 176-93.

³⁶ Bartlett 49-50.

³⁷ "Fall, Hercules, from heav'n in tempests hurl'd / And cleanse this beastly stable of the world" (*Shadow*, "Noctem," ll. 255-56).

most Chapman might offer the temporarily exiled Raleigh³⁸ is an esoteric template for self-representation, one in which the virtue of the individual constitutes its own inner law. If, as Michael Higgins claims, the tenets of classical republicanism are seeded in *The Shadow of Night*, they are yet to flourish.³⁹ A political philosopher rather than politic advisor, Chapman keeps his head, as in his frontispiece portrait to the *Whole Works of Homer* (1616), floating in the clouds.⁴⁰

What emerges forcefully in *The Shadow of Night* is Chapman's attraction to mighty souls struggling against hostile, corrupt, effete forces -- to great men out of favor and "on a quest for consolations."⁴¹ And in 1598 such was the mood of the Essex faction. Pressured by the debacle of the Azores expedition⁴² and the emerging Irish crisis, a Franco-Spanish alliance abroad and appeasement at home, with Cecil actively courting Raleigh and James and Essex s(k)ulking in Wanstead, the Essex circle developed a temporal hyperawareness, an anxiety to seize the time before it ran out. In *Julius Caesar*,

³⁸ Chapman's arrival in London in 1592 coincided with Raleigh's banishment for his secret marriage to Elizabeth Throckmorton the year before. For details, see J.H., Adamson and H.F. Folland, *The Shepherd of the Ocean: An Account of Sir Walter Raleigh and His Times* (Boston: Gambit, 1969), 200-10.

³⁹ Charles W. Kennedy, "Political Theory in the Plays of George Chapman," in *Essays in Dramatic Literature: The Parrott Presentation Volume*, ed. Hardin Craig, (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1935), 73-77.

⁴⁰ For the Chapman portrait, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:George_Chapman.jpg; for its analysis, see John A. Buchtel, "Book Dedications and the Death of a Patron," *Book History: Penn State* 7 (2004), 3-11.

⁴¹ Robert K. Presson, "Wrestling with This World: A View of George Chapman," *PMLA* 84.1 (1969), 44.

⁴² Essex's failed attempt in 1597 to seize an Iberian port in bad storms, and then to commandeer the Spanish silver fleet at the Azores, which he missed by three hours, was financially ruinous to his supporters and damaged his military reputation; see Hammer, *ODNB*, 2008.

likely begun in the autumn of 1598,⁴³ Brutus, Shakespeare's reluctant rebel and regicide, captures the factional *zeitgeist*:

There is a tide in the affairs of men
Which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
(*Julius Caesar* 4.3.218)

Into the "harte of this tumultuous season [and] hot spirited time,"⁴⁴ Chapman made two literary overtures to the Essex circle. Completing Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* (1598), Chapman likened Hero "Devirginate" ("Argument") to "Th'Iberian city [of Cadiz] that war's hand did strike / By English force in princely Essex' guide" ("Third Sestiad" 204-5). Months later, he rushed into print the first eight books of his *opus magnum*, his "englished" Homer's *Iliad*, accompanied by a pair of dedications that radically overhaul the poet's predisposition for over-determined allegory. In April 1598 John Windet published *Seaven Bookes of the Iliades*, with Chapman's epistle dedicatory:

TO THE MOST HONORED
now living Instance of the Achilleian vertues
Eternized by divine Homere, the Earle
Of ESSEX, Earle Marshall, &c.

Chapman quickly followed this first installment of his ground-breaking epic in very un-English fourteeners with the more conventionally pentametric *Achilles' Shield*, a section of Book 18 of *The Iliad*, to which he appended a second dedication, "To the Most Honored, Earle, Earl Marshall." Both the dedicatee and the "Understander[s]" of the following epistles must have been struck by this belligerent analogue. Infamous for the wrath with which classical literature's foremost warrior almost destroyed his Greek allies

⁴³ *Julius Caesar*, Arden 3, ed. David Daniell (London: Methuen, 1998), 12-15.

⁴⁴ "Dedication" to *Seven Books of the Iliad*, Nicoll 135

during the Trojan wars, Achilles had few adherents among English poets who, as John Channing Briggs points out, harbored a “long-standing distrust of Homer and a dislike of the Greek character.”⁴⁵ Yet “the lonely man of Excellence,” in Robert Lowell’s evocative phrase, “unreliable, indispensable, ostracized at the height of his fortune,”⁴⁶ clearly appealed to Chapman, who read in Homer’s Achilles the splendid, reckless potential of Essex’s career.

Equally striking is the uncharacteristic obtuseness of Chapman’s homology. In drawing their analogies between Essex and various martial champions who had transgressed social norms, the other Essexian writers, rather than foreground blatant parallels, at least gesture toward precautionary similitude: for Hayward, Essex’s name *shines on* Henry’s forehead (*e IIII*, “Dedication”); to Shakespeare, he is a “high-loving *likelihood*” of Caesar’s general (*Henry V*, C5. 29); while Daniel writes that “worthy Essex *shouldst* have conducted armies” (*Civil Wars*, 126.3; all my italics). As the *Seven Books*’ dedication unfolds, Chapman’s “Achilleian” adjective coalesces into a proper noun: “Most true Achilles (whom by sacred prophecies Homer did but prefigure” (l.60). Released from the sanctions against representing living figures on stage or in print, and foregoing his usually “farre-fetcht and, as it were, beyond-sea manner of writing” (*Achilles’ Shield*, “To the Understander,” l. 25), Chapman’s symbiosis of classical and contemporary figures explicitly substitutes Achilles for Essex within the text.

⁴⁵ John Channing Briggs, “Chapman’s *Seaven Bookes of the Iliades*: Mirror for Essex,” *Studies in English Literature* 21.1 (1981), 59.

⁴⁶ Robert Lowell, “Epics,” *New York Review of Books* 27.2 (Feb 21 1980), cited in Gordon Braden, *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition*, (Newhaven: Yale UP, 1985), 11.

The “missionary zeal” with which Chapman began translating the *Iliad* speaks to a sense of literary idealism driven by a new ideological energy “writ from a free furie.”⁴⁷ Translating at speed (he claimed he could knock out twelve books in fifteen weeks⁴⁸), Chapman selected Books 1 and 2, then 7 through 11, seemingly to foreground the figure of Achilles and the dire effect on the Greek camp of his falling out with King Agamemnon. Following Achilles’ retreat (1) and Agamemnon’s unsuccessful apology (2), Chapman skips over matters unrelated to the recalcitrant warrior (a dual between Paris and Menelaus, Hector’s departure from the field of battle, Diomedes’ assault on Troy, all indecisive acts), to focus on Hector’s vital counterattack (7-9), which puts fierce pressure on the Greek ships. Following Agamemnon’s demeaning embassy to Achilles, Book 11 ends with disaster impending for the Greeks. Though Chapman would later fill in the missing books in his completed *Iliad* of 1611, his 1598 narrative exposes and magnifies Greek vulnerability in the absence of Achilles.

Perhaps complicated by his own evolving philosophy, the ideological rationale behind the Achilles-Essex parallel is less straightforward than Chapman’s affective intentions. The translation repeatedly underlines Achilles’ royal pedigree, much as Chapman’s dedication signs off by praising Essex’s “princelie vertues” (l.146), a risky entitlement that might well have encouraged Hayward to analogize Essex and his royal ancestor, Henry, Duke of Hereford, a year later. In 1598 Chapman renders Homer’s “son of Peleus” “a king’s heire” (l.288), though by 1611 Achilles is once more familiarized as “Thetis’ son.” Yet the status of royalty is consistently interrogated both in the Homeric

⁴⁷ Chapman contrasts Homer to the studied courtliness of Vergil in *Achilles’ Shield*, “Dedication,” l.35.

⁴⁸ “The Preface to the Reader,” *Iliad* (1609), l.77.

Achilles' challenges to the very idea of kingship over the loose federation of Greek peoples and in Chapman's pointed vilification of Agamemnon. The divinely elected monarch, "To whom wise Saturn's sonne hath given both law and Emperie / To rule the publicke is that king" (2.173-75) is, to Achilles, merely a "frontless man [who] triumphs make with bonfires of [his soldiers'] bane" (1.159-60).

Chapman is willing to "modify and expand his basic text" to get at the "Homerical" truth ("Dedication," 1.25), much as the Tacitean historian fashioned political dicta from invented speeches. And often, as Briggs points out, these renditions serve to condemn Agamemnon's abuse of his soldiers (whom he tricks into desertion in order to test them [2.55 ff.]) and his exploitation of his military commanders. "O thou possest with Impudence, that in command of men / Affectst the brute mind of a Fox," Achilles complains, raising the image of a Cecilian Agamemnon, "for so thou fill thy denne / With forced or betrayed spoiles thou feelst no sense of shame!" (1.154-56).⁴⁹ Elsewhere Agamemnon takes on the guise of Raleigh when he admits to his rivalry with Achilles for Briseis, a Theban princess: "My selfe and Thetis' sonne / (Like girles) in words fought for a girle, and I th'offence begunne" (2.331-32). Chapman even glances at Elizabeth herself as Agamemnon's seizure of the Theban princess, which initiates the conflict with Achilles, echoes Elizabeth's refusal to release Essex's hostages following Cadiz.⁵⁰ "Sacred Thebes" becomes a "profane" and "wealthie towne" (1.383 ff), much as

⁴⁹ Often accused of avarice, Burghley was mocked as the Fox in *Prosopopoia, or Mother Hubbard's Tale*, who "fed his cubs with fat of all the soyle" (1151); Edmund Spenser, *The Works of Edmund Spenser*, 12 vols (Baltimore: John Hopkins P, 1966).

⁵⁰ For details of the Cadiz hostage crisis, see Harrison, 128-31. Arguably Shakespeare draws a similar parallel in *1 Henry IV*, with the king's sequestration of Hotspur's Holmedon hostages (1.3.15-124).

Chapman had previously styled the “wealthie [...] *Iberian* citie” conquered by Essex in *Hero and Leander*. Against Agamemnon, locus of growing oppositional forces, the symbiotic Essex-Achilles represents “the whole excellence of royall humanitie” (“Dedication,” ll.62-63), the noble soul from a golden age that preceded imperial authority. While Chapman doesn’t invent these episodes, he does create or encourage the parallels.

Five years later, Bussy D’Ambois, the apotheosis of “royal man,” would begin to challenge the monarchy directly, but in the 1598 *Iliad* Chapman appears to have had simpler aims. In contrast to the Taciteans, Chapman’s paratexts abandon any interest in “the Pessant-common polities of the world” (“Dedication,” l.63) in favor of Homer’s affective power to stir the noble soul to action. Homer, Chapman declares, is a war-poet who offers Essex “a true portraite of ancient stratagems and disciplines of war, wherein it will be worthie little lesse than admireation of your apprehensive judgement to note in many things the affinitie they have with your present complements of field” (“Dedication,” ll.136-38). Essex-Achilles’ withdrawal from the political hegemony, Chapman seems to say, is noble and understandable, but no longer defensible. Nestor, the old sage of the poem, concludes Book 11 with what sounds like a factional call-to-arms in defense of the federation:

When will Peleus’ son some royall pittie show?
On his thus wounded contrimen? Ah, is he yet to know
How much affliction tires our host -- how our especiall aide
(Tainted with lances) at their tents are miserably laide?
[...]
Does he reserve his eye
Till our fleet burne and we our selves one after other die?
(*Iliad* 11.571-78)

Anger, observes Gordon Braden, is the first word in classical literature: “*mênis*, the announced theme of the *Iliad*, and the ruling emotion of the best warrior among the Greeks.”⁵¹ And anger both begins and ends Chapman’s Homeric rapture of 1598. Opening his *Seaven Bookes* with the invocation, “Achilles’ banefull wrath resound,” Chapman brings to a close *Achilles’ Shield* with “the wreakfull vowes / Of [Thetis’] enraged Sonne, [...] With Vulcan’s armes wrought for eternall day” (324-26). Achilles’ *furor*, defined by Braden as “heroic anger diffused uncontrollably when the honorific borders [...] become elusive and unreal,” is contained within the crucible of Chapman’s Homeric translations.⁵²

Chapman’s paratexts eulogize the contemplative life, which is “most worthily and divinely preferred by Plato to the active, as much as the head to the foote, the eye to the hand, reason to sence” (“To the Reader,” ll.34-36), while concurrently describing Homer as “the wealthie ornmament to the studies [of kings] and the main battayle of their armies” (*Achilles’ Shield*, “Dedication,” ll.134-35). Briggs writes of this paradox: “The translation and its prefaces consequently call for intellectual devotion to Homer, while sometimes seeming to declare active war on all forms of foreign and domestic corruption, be they in Ireland, England, or even proximate to the Queen.”⁵³ And there is a textual suggestion that Essex responded at least in part to Chapman’s dedication and heard his rallying cry. In his *Apology to Mr. Anthony Bacon*, written that year and publicly disseminated among his friends, Essex articulates the nobility’s antipathy to peace

⁵¹ Gordon Braden, *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition* (Newhaven: Yale UP, 1985), 12.

⁵² Braden 14.

⁵³ Briggs 71.

negotiations with Spain, which they judged a waste of their recent war efforts and an affront to the Protestant cause abroad. Describing Spain's enduring martial intentions, Essex seems to have had Homer's *Iliad* -- or Chapman's version of it -- at the front of his mind:

[T]heir first maine attempt against England was in 88. From that time to this present is full tenne years, the just time of the siege of Troy. And now they see open force cannot prevaile, they have prepared a Sinons horse, which cannot enter if we cast not down our walls.⁵⁴

To Essex, this "Sinons [or Trojan] horse" was Ireland, the back door through which Spain, liberated from her wars with France, would soon attempt to invade England.

Yet if the initiation of the Irish expedition of 1599 was a glorious vindication of Chapman's Homeric enterprise and his ambitions for a new patron, Essex's military failure and subsequent rebellion must have seemed like life (and death) imitating art: the "lonely man of Excellence" returned a traitor, his reputation washed up on the shores of Ireland, fated like Achilles to die young. Seemingly stunned by Essex's dramatic downfall, Chapman laid aside his Homeric translation for "a full tenne years," resuming the project only in the aftermath of the *Byron* plays. Thereafter, as Allardyce Nicoll notes, Homer was no longer dominated by Achilles and his questionable virtues: "the true ideal [...] more nearly might be found in Hector or, better still, in the much-tried and wise Ulysses."⁵⁵

In the ten-year period between 1598-1608, Essex's apparent absence from Chapman's writing suggests that *The Iliad* had been merely a flirtation with high politics

⁵⁴ *The Earl of Essex's Vindication of the War with Spain, in an Apology to Mr. Anthony Bacon. Penn'd by Himself, Anno 1598* (London, c. 1603), B⁴.

⁵⁵ *Chapman's Homer*, ed. Nicholl xii.

-- for which the poet was fortunate to escape official scrutiny, his Achilleian analogy presumably too remote to be topically dangerous -- and an ill-fated attempt at patronage.⁵⁶ Short of cash, Chapman focused upon his playwriting career, exploring, and often inventing, new dramatic forms: humorous city comedies *May Day* [1601] and *All Fools* (1602); topical satires *Monsieur D'Olive* (1603) and *Eastward Ho!* (1604); the first tragedy for a boys' company, *Bussy D'Ambois* (1604). Despite the patent risks of mentioning Essex during Elizabeth's remaining years, however, vestiges of Essex appear within two Chapman pieces, both of which help to trace the evolutionary path toward *Byron*. The first, a short, largely neglected poem, "*Peristeros: or the male Turtle*,"⁵⁷ is appended to Robert Chester's densely allegorical *Love's Martyr* (1601), a mixed verse epic whose Essexian implications have long been contested.⁵⁸ Conversely, *Bussy D'Ambois* discourages an Essexian reading, as if its many radical shifts -- from Homer to Seneca, from Achilles to Hercules, from Greece to France, from heroic drama to something approaching melodrama -- reveal Chapman's attempts to slough off his factional past. Yet I read such shifts as productive displacements through which Chapman explores the decline of the political demigod within the contemporary court

⁵⁶ In contrast to Daniel, Chapman was preternaturally unfortunate in his choice of patrons. Essex was executed in 1601; Raleigh was imprisoned in the tower from 1603-13 and then beheaded; the eighteen-year-old Prince Henry, patron of the remaining Homeric translations, succumbed to typhoid fever in 1612; and Robert Carr, first Earl of Somerset, whose scandalous marriage to Frances Howard following her divorce from Essex's allegedly impotent son was defended by Chapman in his poem *Andromeda Liberata* (1613), was convicted of poisoning his former mentor Sir Thomas Overbury and languished in the Tower from 1615 to 1622.

⁵⁷ According to the Liddell-Scott-Jones Lexicon of Classical Greek, "peristeros" is a male or cock-pigeon; <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>, May 2012.

⁵⁸ For the various identifications of the Turtle, see Anthea Hume, "*Love's Martyr*, 'the Phoenix and the Turtle,' and the Aftermath of the Essex Rebellion," *The Review of English Studies* 40.157 (1989), 48-49.

milieu. Instead of replacing one classical analogy with another, Chapman conflates Achilles with Hercules, refashioning the dislocated warrior into the reluctant scourge, an apology for Essex and also something of a resurrection. In this endeavor Chapman likely encouraged Daniel, *Bussy's* licenser, to complete *Philotas*, but I suggest that he also attracted the antipathy of Shakespeare, the long-time rival who, in the aftermath of the *Richard II* commission, was making concerted efforts to extricate himself from the Essex circle and its factional interests. Chapman's allusive intentions are brought more sharply into focus by Shakespeare's abutting yet oppositional works: his "Threnody" to *Love's Martyr* of 1601 and his 1602 *Troilus and Cressida*.

3. "Alive we lov'd him; dead we love him more"⁵⁹

Despite enduring two blows to the shoulders before the ax man finally severed his head, Essex, according to eyewitness accounts, died well. To his sympathizers he maintained dignity in contrition and suffered the botched execution in silence: "The headsman did his part, / Cruelly, cruelly, / He was not seen to start, / For all his blows."⁶⁰ The authorities and the gentlemen seated around the scaffold, on the other hand, were more concerned that Essex confess his treason, and thereby bring closure to the trial and an end to his popular reputation. And, according to Thomas Cook's "Account of the Death of Essex," the Earl dutifully acknowledged "this bloudie, this cryinge, this infectious sinne, whereby so manie for love to mee, have bene drawne to offend god, to

⁵⁹ "Verses upon the report of the death of the right honourable the Lord of Essex" in *Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative*, ed. Robert Harding Evans (London: Bulmer, 1810), 3.217.

⁶⁰ "A lamentable ditty on the death of Robert Devereux, earl of Essex, who was beheaded in the Tower of London, on Ash-Wednesday, 1600-1," in Evans 3:120.

offend their sovereigne, and to offende the worlde.”⁶¹ If he died well, however, Essex’s spirit did not stay dead for long, soon experiencing an extraordinary resurrection in a wealth of anonymous and unregulated post-execution ballads and ghost narratives.⁶² Unsettled, the government commissioned Francis Bacon to write *A Declaration of the Practises and Treasons attempted and committed by Robert late Earle of Essex*, which disclosed Essex’s damning confessions, augmented his menace, and demeaned his aspirations: “it was not the reputations of a famous leader in the Warres which hee sought [...] but onely power and greatnesse to serve his own ends.”⁶³ This blatant piece of propaganda, which the much-maligned Bacon later claimed was all but ghostwritten by the Queen,⁶⁴ purports to correct malicious misconceptions concerning the trial: “There do pass abroad in the hands of many men divers false and corrupt Collections and Relations of the proceedings and the arraignment of the late Earle of Essex.”⁶⁵ In reality, the *Declaration* revealed the extent and persistence of popular dissent posed by the balladeers and pamphleteers. On April 5 1601, the Privy Council turned to the law, issuing a royal proclamation against “divers traitorous and slanderous libels [that] have of late been dispersed in divers parts of our city [...] tending to the slander of our royal

⁶¹ Evans 208

⁶² See Bernard Capp, “Popular Literature,” in *Popular Culture in Seventeenth Century England*, ed. Barry Reay (New York: St. Martin's, 1985), 215-42.

⁶³ Francis Bacon, *A Declaration of the Practises and Treasons attempted and committed by Robert late Earle of Essex and his complices, against her Maiestie and her Kingdoms* (London, 1601), B^r.

⁶⁴ In *Sir Francis Bacon his Apologie in certain imputations concerning the Late Earle of Essex* (1604), Bacon diminishes his responsibility for the *Declaration* by claiming that the Queen had “commanded me to put pen to book, [...] which I did, but so as never secretary had more particular and express directions and instructions in every point how to guide my hand in it”; quoted in Spedding: 3.159.

⁶⁵ Bacon, *A Declaration of the Practises and Treasons attempted and committed by Robert late Earle of Essex* (London, 1601), A¹.

person and state, and stirring up of rebellion and sedition within this our realm.”⁶⁶

Considering how much of the ballad ephemera survive, the proclamation had little obvious effect.

The hostile wording of the decree is noteworthy because most of the ballads seem anything but slanderous of Elizabeth. Lament after lament describes a country in mourning -- "Widdowes waile and sigh in singing/ Maydes sit weeping, their hands wringing"⁶⁷ -- with the Queen suffering most of all: "For grieve each pretty bird hath changd his noate, / For grieve each beast and bird is prest to dye; / For grieve my Essex dyed, and so will I."⁶⁸ In response, Essex exceeds the conventional traitor's expressions of loyalty ("I have a sinner been, / Welladay, &c. / Yet never wronged my queen"⁶⁹) by begging the injunction of a hurt mistress -- "Let Loues submission Honours wrath appease" -- to whom he willingly martyrs himself: "Oh! that my death might have suffis'd for thyne! / Thy life was life to me, thy death is myne!"⁷⁰ Turning adversaries into wounded lovers reconciled in death, a move that initiated the generationally improbable romance between Elizabeth and Essex that would shortly grace the popular stage,⁷¹ might seem a placatory gesture by the Earl's supporters that hardly warranted the

⁶⁶ *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, ed. P. L. Hughes and F.J. Larkin, 3 vols. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1964-), 3:233.

⁶⁷ "A mournfull dittie made on the death of the late Earle of Essex" (1.88-89), quoted in Tipton, 68.

⁶⁸ "Verses upon the report of the death of the right honourable the Lord of Essex," eds. Furnivall and Morfill, *Ballads from Manuscripts* (London: Ballad Society, 1873), 2.219.

⁶⁹ "Lamentable ditty," Evans, 119.

⁷⁰ "Robert Earle of Essex against Sir Walter Rawleigh," Furnivall and Morfill, 251.

⁷¹ The well-known anecdote asserting that Essex's release was contingent upon his returning the Queen's ring first appears in John Webster's *Devil's Law Case* (1632),

government's draconian crackdown. Yet, as Tipton points out, Essex's "highly charged" transformation into a passive lover directly contradicted the government line of a hardened rebel, thereby allowing "the author[s] of the work[s] to express support for Essex without being implicated in the perceived treason of his rebellion."⁷² Still more dangerous, the recuperation of Essex, perhaps even his rebirth, is frequently imagined through the Queen's death: "For grieffe my Essex dyed, and so will I"; "Thy life was life to me, thy death is myne!" Imbued with a premature post-Elizabethan nostalgia, these post-execution ballads offer a subtle critique in which Elizabeth, by ordering the execution of her Knight Marshall, foreshadows the end of her own heroic age: she has outlived her time.

This complex rhetorical strategy for critiquing Elizabeth and praising Essex while seemingly eulogizing both was not, however, invented by the balladeers. In late 1601 Robert Chester published *Love's Martyr*, a long, densely allegorical poem that daringly fashions a new way to think about Elizabeth's imminent passing as a metaphorized phoenix that will rise again from the ashes, either as herself or in the form of James, a second phoenix that appears toward the end of the poem. Chester's allusive trope -- a necessary invention that is "freer than the times" (*Loves Martyr, Vatum Chorus*, p.180)⁷³

followed by La Calprenede's *Le Comte d'Essex* (1639). Two Restoration plays, *The secret history of the most renown'd Q. Elizabeth and the E. of Essex* (1680), by an anonymous "person of quality," and John Bank's *The Unhappy Favourite* (1682), employ the ring story as a key plot device, as does the Michael Curtiz movie *The Private Lives of Elizabeth and Essex*, starring Bette Davis and Errol Flynn (Warner, 1939); see Winifred Smith, "The Earl of Essex on Stage," *PMLA* 39.1 (1924), 147-73.

⁷² Tipton 67, n. 35.

⁷³ All references to *Love's Martyr* are from *Miscellanies*, ed. A.B. Grosart (New Shakespeare Society: Vaduz, 1965), and will be cited parenthetically by page and, where applicable, stanza and line.

-- is daring for two reasons. First, as the dedication to "Sir John Salisburie" implies, Chester's "long expected labour," though published in 1601, was begun some time earlier. If, as Alexander B. Grosart argues, "Paphos Isle," the Phoenix's "sure defense" (*Loves Martyr* p.33, l.7), alludes to Ireland, then the bulk of the poem was probably composed around the time of the Irish expedition of early 1599. "That Elizabeth was still alive -- and a terrible old lioness still when her pride was touched," Grosart comments, "fills me indeed with astonishment at the author's audacity in so publishing" (*Loves Martyr* p.xlvi). Secondly, most of the poem is structured around a dialogue between the Phoenix and her loyal companion/lover, the Turtle[dove] prior to their mutual self-immolation, which seemingly reconfigures the older Richard II - Bolingbroke parallel between Elizabeth and Essex in less oppositional terms.

Not every scholar aligns the Turtle with Essex.⁷⁴ Anthea Hume, while agreeing that "Chester, in his stumbling fashion, was handling a subject of great complexity, [namely] the Queen's state of mind in the aftermath of the Essex Rebellion," recently argued that the Turtle represents the people and that Envy, figuring "the malicious slanders of pro-Essex supporters," must be banished before the damaged Queen can rebirth."⁷⁵ Following *Love's Martyr*, however, the post-execution ballads began to associate Essex with grieving birds: "each [...] bird is prest to dye; / For grieve my Essex dyed, and so will I" ("Lamentable ditty"). In "Robert Earle of Essex against Sir Walter Rawleigh," the author even introduces the newfangled phoenix image: "Oh let no

⁷⁴ For a summary of the scholarly interpretations of the two central figures in Chester's poem, see Tipton, "Transformation," 59, n.3.

⁷⁵ Hume 63 and 58-60.

Phoenix looke upon a Crowe.”⁷⁶ The balladeer’s association of Essex with avian martyrdom supports Grosart’s conclusion that the Turtle is “Essex, and Essex alone, and Essex in every detail” (*Loves Martyr* lii).

If we allow that Essex is at least the primary association with the Turtle, then Chester’s subsequent inclusion of “Poeticall Essaies [...] by the best and chieftest of our modern writers” (*Loves Martyr* p.177) in his edition of 1601 becomes more than commercial puffery. Publishing under the same title for the only time, Shakespeare and Chapman, alongside Ben Jonson and John Marston, contributed occasional verses to Chester’s work. This disharmonious group -- Jonson and Marston were at the height of a literary feud in 1601⁷⁷ -- was broadly united in its willingness to engage in factional writing and had suspected or confirmed associations with Essex.⁷⁸ If, as seems plausible, the 1599 *Love’s Martyr*, like the *Seven Books of the Iliad* and *Henry V*, encouraged support for Essex’s Irish expedition, then Chapman and Shakespeare’s post-execution reflections on Chester’s topos chart their diverging attitudes toward Essex.

⁷⁶ Furnivall and Morfill 251.

⁷⁷ I refer to the War of the Theaters sparked by Marston’s *Historiomastix* (1600), which initiated a feud that accelerated from the literary to the physical (Jonson claimed to have beaten Marston and stolen his pistol). For details, see James P Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poet’s War* (New York: Columbia UP, 2001), 83-104, and Clare 80-93.

⁷⁸ Despite his recent arrival on the literary scene, it is possible that Marston was included among the contributors because of indirect references to Essex in Balurdo’s song as he is shipped off to prison in the recently performed *Antonio’s Revenge* of May 1601. “Why then, O wight, / Alas, poor knight! / O welladay, / Sir Geoffrey! / Let poet’s roar, / And all deplore; / For now I bid you goodnight” (4.3.153-59), echoes two post-execution ballads: “A Lamentable Ditty,” with its repeated refrain, “Welladay! Welladay!,” and “A Lamentable new Ballad upon the Earle of Essex his Death,” which ends with the word: “Good-night.” In line with the occasional verses, Antonio’s final speech (5.6.60-65) also anticipates the Queen’s death. See John Marston, *Antonio and Mellida & Antonio’s Revenge*, Malone Society Reprints (Oxford: OUP, 1921).

Where Chester portrays a relationship built on reciprocity and remission, in which the Turtle's self-immolation, which revivifies the monarch's office, is the appropriate response to a prior "foule offence" (*Loves Martyr* p.133, 2.4)," Shakespeare's "lay" is a "shrieking harbinger" (p.182, 2.1) of mutual self-destruction and political extinction. Thirteen stanzas of four-line ballad meter summon the reader to a double funeral overseen by "the Eagle feath' red King" (3.4), a cleric Swan, and a "treble dated Crow" (5.1), a kind of professional mourner in sable leading the lament. Shakespeare recycles geometric and numerological images from recent comedies -- the "union in partition" (*MND* 3.2.211) between Helena and Hermia in *Midsummer Night's Dream* and the "One face, one voice, one habit, and two persons" (*TN* 5.1.208) that Viola and Sebastian present to an amazed Ilyria -- to represent the propinquity of the Turtle and his Queen: "Two distincts, Division none, / Number there in love was slaine" (*Loves Martyr* p.183, 7.3-4). But where the Athenian schoolgirls' friendship was as fresh as "a double cherry" (*MND* 3.2.210) and the twins of Messaline complete a "natural perspective" (*TN* 5.1.209), the birds' relationship seems unnaturally fused:

Reason in itself confounded,
Saw Division grow together,
To themselves yet either neither,
Simple were so well compounded.
(*Loves Martyr* p.183, 5.11)

A love that is both selfless and self-serving challenges the established division between ruler and subject and risks contaminating or rupturing the hereditary line. Both parties, moreover, are responsible:

So betweene them Love did shine,
That the *Turtle* saw *his right*,
Flaming in the *Phoenix* sight;

Either was the other's mine.

(*Loves Martyr* p.183, l.9)

The Turtle reads, perhaps misreads, his “right” (a word loaded with the burden of succession) in the adoring looks of his mistress. Shakespeare employs the paradoxical image of the “mine” as both rich and explosive in a clause that intentionally confuses the matter of who possesses the advantage, that asks: Who owns who? Yet, as the four-line ballad diminishes to a three-line lament, Reason draws the ineluctable conclusion that both birds chose for their own ends a terminal path: “Leaving no posteritie, / Twas not their infirmitie, / It was married Chastitie” (p.184, “*Threnos*” 3). Chester’s *topos* implies that the Phoenix (the monarchy in general or Queen Elizabeth in particular) is not self-sufficient and self-generative, but requires the Turtle (be it the people, the aristocracy, or Essex) to complete herself, validate her rule, and confirm her succession: “Burne both our bodies to revive one name” (p.136, 3.4). Capturing his post-factional mood, Shakespeare’s lament has no such resurrection, no life beyond its own final words: “to this urne let those repaire, / That are either true or faire, / For these dead Birds, sigh a prayer” (p.184, 5). The poem suggests that both a royal line and a political circle have been broken by the delusional aspirations, the fantasies, and the ambitions of the old Phoenix and her young Turtle.

If Shakespeare’s nihilistic treatment skews Chester’s *topos* toward a kind of atavistic redundancy, Chapman’s twenty-six lines of iambic pentameter in ballad rhyme struggle to make any sense of the monomorphic relationship between the “Bird of love” and “his sole-mate” (p.180, ll.13-14); indeed, he does not even name the birds within the poem. The title *Peristeros: or the male Turtle* implies, however, that even in the

immediate aftermath of the failed rebellion, Chapman's thoughts often revolved around Essex and the political forces that brought him down, the "loose and partie-liver'd Sect, / Of idle Lovers that [...] Change their Affections with their Mistris Sights" (*Peristeros* ll.1-4). Eschewing any notion of previous wrongdoing by the male bird, the poem places culpability implicitly on the female -- "Excesse of all things, he joyd in her measure" (l.19) -- and explicitly on the machinations of "the prowd flockes of other Foules" (l.15) ranged against him. Chapman even inserts himself into the final lines, intruding awkwardly into the avian monogamy to generate an "us and them" quality with the outside world: "Like him I bound th'instinct of all my powers, / In her that bounds the Empire of desert. [...] This is my form, and gives my being, spirit" (ll.20-26). Albeit couched in the romantic terms of the trope, Chapman's concerns remain factional and his engagement candidly partisan.

Shakespeare's poem, which ends without a future, has no title. In contrast, Marston, a proto-Jacobean writer with his life in front of him, offers "*A narration and description of a / most exact wondrous creature, arising / out of the Phoenix and Turtle / Doves ashes*" (*Love's Martyr* p.185). We might assume, then, that Chapman's titular concern with the Turtle promises a lament for Essex, a nostalgic looking back to what might have been. But "Peristeros" is not quite a requiem because no one has yet -- or at least not quite yet -- died. The grammatical shift in the following passage suggests that the Turtle's past is both present and still to come: "She was to him th'*Analysde* World of pleasure, / Her firmnesse cloth'd him in varietie; [...] Mourn'd when she mourn'd, and *dieth when she dies*" (*Peristeros* ll.18-21; my italics). As if seeking a way to deal with the death of Essex, Chapman situates the Turtle in a kind of limbo, past life but not dead until

the death of his Phoenix Queen. Such a move comes perilously close to co-opting one of the prerogatives of the Queen's two bodies: Essex is dead, long live Essex. Whereas *Love's Martyr* figures Essex as dying for Elizabeth, in Chapman's poem Elizabeth lives, or survives, for Essex.

Although Shakespeare and Chapman manipulate Chester's trope in antithetical ways -- the one to consume the pair of birds prematurely, the other to keep them alive preternaturally -- they both contribute to, perhaps in part initiate, a literary subset of ghost narratives that resuscitated and sustained the posthumous Essex persona through the death of Elizabeth and well into the Stuart era. Whereas the post-execution ballads offer a gentler image of Essex and his Queen, the ghost narratives sound an aggressively political tone from beyond the grave. In 1624 Essex would twice emerge "from Elizian" to put "an English-Flea in [the] Spanish eare" by directly challenging the proposed match between Prince Charles and Phillip II's daughter, Maria Ana,⁷⁹ but in the immediate fallout from the rebellion these spectral sentiments seem primarily to express the Essex faction's reluctance to let go of its leader. "Honors thoughts...Doe make [Essex] live, though long since dead / And crownes with bayes his buried head," declared soldier and pamphleteer Robert Pricket in *Honors fame in triumph riding* (1604), a public and potentially treasonous statement that got its author thrown in jail.⁸⁰ The rambling, self-consciously literary author of "Verses upon the Report of the Death of the right

⁷⁹ Robert Earle of Essex *His Ghost: Sent from Elizian* 8. Both this political pamphlet and its sequel, *A Post-Script, or, A Second Part*, which were "Printed in Paradise" in 1624, were actually penned by the Reverend Thomas Scott, who was later murdered in Holland.

⁸⁰ Robert Pricket, *Honors Fame in Triumph Riding, or, the Life and Death of the Late Honorable Earle of Essex* (London, 1604), A⁴.

Honourable the Lord of Essex”⁸¹ (anon c.1601-2), goes even further to suggest that Essex might be alive in more than reputation: “Knowe this, that ESSEX lives; how could he dye? [...] / Had hee bin dead, I should not now bin I. / Hee lives, I live, his life is life to me (ll.764-67). In their refusal to accept the metaphorical death of Essex, these ghost narratives confirm that the faction, sustained in considerable part by the efforts of its literary wing, did not simply die out with its leader. Moreover, while Shakespeare and Chapman rejected Chester’s harmonizing trope, they continued to wrestle with the consequences of Essex’s demise and, consequently, with their antagonistic dialogue, from the public forum of the stage.

Sometime in late 1601 Shakespeare penned the experimental *Troilus and Cressida*,⁸² a generically ambivalent work that fashions both a halfhearted farewell to chivalry and fallen idols and a savage critique of factionalism. “Beginning in the middle” of the siege of Troy (Prologue, 27), and abruptly ending with the murder of Hector, Shakespeare’s play inhabits an ethical and political no-mans-land devoid of catharsis, resolution, or hope. Although the play’s titular plot explores the popular medieval romances of Caxton, Chaucer, and Lydgate, the drama’s political concern with the infighting between the Greeks and Trojans, many of whom, like Ajax and Hector (4.5.84-87), are friends and relatives, draws heavily on Chapman’s version of Homer’s *Iliad*.⁸³ The progress of the war, the critical debate between centralized versus tribal authority,

⁸¹ Evans 217-39.

⁸² For a summary of the outdated theory that *Troilus* was written in 1598, at the height of the War of the Theatres, see Bevington 6-11.

⁸³ *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Trouye* by Raoul Lefevre, trans. Caxton (1474), Henry Chaucer’s *The Book of Troilus and Criseyde*, (c.1380s), and John Lydgate’s *Troy Book* (c.1320s). For a full discussion of Shakespeare’s sources, see Bevington 375-97.

and Agamemnon's mismanagement of his competing factions -- "Troy in our weakness lives, not in her strength," says Ulysses (1.3.137) -- are all in the *Seaven Bookes*.

Yet Shakespeare radically alters Chapman's characterization of Achilles, refiguring the magnificent *furor* of Chapman's warrior as a massive sulk, encouraged (depending on the commentator) by the histrionic talents of a homosexual paramour Patroclus (Ulysses and Nestor, 1.3.142-95) or by Achilles' traitorous love for the Trojan Polyxena, daughter of King Priam and Hecuba (Patroclus, 3.3.218-35). According to Eric S. Mallin, Shakespeare's Achilles, divested of Chapman's "demidivinity," becomes a "terrific nuisance [who] disturbs the order of things" and refuses to leave his tent while his "thuggish Myrmidons" range about looking for trouble.⁸⁴ On the rare occasions when Achilles emerges into daylight, he is a shadow of his former self, dead in deed if not yet in body, and living on a reputation that "hangs / Quite out of fashion, like a rusty mail / In monumental mock'ry" (3.3.152-54). Finally goaded into action by the death of Patroclus (rather than the machinations of a Greek administration as devoid of imagination as he is of honor), Achilles descends to butchery, commanding his Myrmidons to slaughter the unarmed Hector, whose body is then tied to the victor's horse and dragged in triumph between the Greek and Trojan lines. As Richard S. Ide writes, "*Troilus* marks the condemnation by William Shakespeare of the 'heroick' genre that idolizes a destructive egomania in the name of heroic individualism."⁸⁵

⁸⁴ Eric S. Mallin, "Emulous Factions and the Collapse of the Chivalry: *Troilus and Cressida*," *Representations* 29 (1990), 148-50.

⁸⁵ Richard S. Ide, *Possessed with Greatness* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1980), 17.

In 1884, George Bernard Shaw, reading *Troilus* as a culmination of Shakespeare's "development as a pessimist," judged the "clever, elegant, sensual, entirely unscrupulous" Achilles as no worse than his fellow commanders, Ajax ("a mere brute") and Ulysses ("a mere politician"), and the Trojans no better than the Greeks, all of whom mingle "ferocity with cupidity." Achilles' righteous and violent indignation is the product of a political system at war with itself for a rotten, almost forgotten, cause. "All the argument is a whore and a cuckold," says Thersites, recalling the Queen at the heart of the contention, "a good quarrel to draw emulous factions and bleed to death upon" (2.3.69-71). To Shaw, however, *Troilus* critiqued Chapman's *Iliad* only insofar as Chapman valorized Homer, whose "ships and shields" Shakespeare firmly rejected: Shakespeare repudiated Homer, not Chapman.⁸⁶ Yet in his 1982 Oxford edition of *Henry V* Gary Taylor points to passages on the eve of Agincourt -- a disguised Henry "Walking from watch to watch" (*H5 C4.30*) and conversing with "a good old commander" (4.1.93) -- that reveal Shakespeare borrowing from Books 9 and 10 of Chapman's *Iliad* for evocative descriptions to "fill the dramatic interval between nightfall and sunrise."⁸⁷ Shakespeare's subsequent inversion of Homer's heroic milieu and corruption of its champion Achilles, "strengthened [Bevington notes] by the thematizing of chivalry" in the Chaucerian bi-plot,⁸⁸ suggests some kind of readjustment of Shakespeare's Homeric position between the 1599 *Henry V* and *Troilus* in 1602. The construction and

⁸⁶ For a full transcript of Shaw's address to the "New Shaksper Society," see Louis Crompton and Hilayne Cavanaugh, "Shaw's Lecture on *Troilus and Cressida*," *The Shaw Review*, 14.2 (1971), 48-67.

⁸⁷ William Shakespeare, *Henry V*, ed. Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1982), 53.

⁸⁸ Bevington 15.

dissemination of the Essex-Achilles analogy by Shakespeare's long-standing rival in *The Iliad*, his company's possible feeling of betrayal following the *Richard II* commission (which I discuss in the Shakespeare chapter), his own sense of disenchantment in *Hamlet*, and his failure to find a productive literary resolution in the avian imagery of *Love's Complaint*, suggests that Shakespeare wrote *Troilus and Cressida* in part as an obituary to Essex and his faction following their failed coup d'état of February 1601.

If, as I suspect, Shakespeare hoped that *Troilus* would offer his company's final judgment and the last word from the literary circle on the defunct Essex project, then, in paradoxical ways, he failed. On the one hand, *Troilus* possibly received no public performance or, like that other Trojan play remembered by Hamlet, was acted "not above once; [for] / 'Twas caviare to the general" (2.2.417-18). Turning an underperforming play into a literary rarity, the publisher's preface to the much delayed 1609 B Quarto claims that *Troilus* was "never stal'd with the stage, never clapper-clawd with the palmes of the vulgar."⁸⁹ Further on, the preface raises the extraordinary possibility that the play had been suppressed not by the authorities but by the "grand possessors" who materially owned it, namely Shakespeare's fellow sharers.⁹⁰ Although Mallin convincingly argues that Shakespeare, replicating the evasive tactics of his second tetralogy of history plays

⁸⁹ According to Bevington, *Troilus and Cressida* was published in "two states [commonly termed A and B] with two different title pages and front matter, one advertising the play as having been acted by the King's Majesty's servants, [...] the other insisting that the play was never acted" (3). Such claims might have been "a bookseller's flourish to promote sale" (Parrott 656), and *Troilus'* early performance history remains an enigma.

⁹⁰ I identify the "possessors" as Shakespeare's sharers on the grounds that a formally banned play by London's premier playwright would have generated an official record (none exists), while self-censorship would have likely produced a structural reorganization similar to Shakespeare's Q1 *Henry V*.

distributed the self-conflicted Essex persona among oppositional figures such as the obsessively chivalric Hector,⁹¹ Chapman's 1598 Homeric preface seems to have indelibly synthesized Achilles and Essex in the public imagination. As such, we might surmise that Burbage (presumably slated to play Achilles) and company were unwilling to risk the ire of the authorities again by indulging Shakespeare's need for political purgation. This possible glimpse of internecine friction backstage at the Globe raises the intriguing possibility that Shakespeare, like the cynical commentator Thersites, was the "cheese and [...] digestion" (2.3.39) to a political master he loved to loathe but could never quite leave, and that his attempts to throw over his allegiance to Essex were personal, painful, and protracted.

If Shakespeare struggled to evangelize his anti-factionalism from the stage of the Globe, it seems, conversely, that his Achilleian postmortem -- via stage, page, or reputation -- galvanized Chapman into renewed reflections upon the validity and significance of using the Homeric trope for the posthumous Essex. In late 1602 or early 1603 Chapman began plotting *Bussy D'Ambois*, arguably his greatest play and the first of four tragedies -- followed by *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron* (1608), the *Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois* (1611), and *The Tragedy of Chabot, Admiral of France* (c.1612) -- that dramatize the political scene in near contemporary France.⁹² Although each play is innovative in its own way, the corpus charts the trajectory of a

⁹¹ The conflict between Achilles' noble fury and Hector's "chivalric obsession" leads Essex, in Mallin's words, to "metaphorically [kill] himself as Hector kills the Unknown Knight," 168.

⁹² Between *Revenge* and *Chabot* (Parrott 655), Chapman wrote his only Roman tragedy, *Caesar and Pompey* (c.1612-13), a static, philosophical piece that perhaps comes closest to expounding an argument for classical republicanism, as announced on the play's title page: "ONLY A JUST MAN IS A FREE MAN."

particular kind of antihero, “a “lonely figure,” in Millar MacLure’s words, who is “assured by inward powers [yet] surrounded by ignorants, backbiters, misunderstanders, savages, baying monsters.”⁹³ While in the later tragedies the emotionally remote, philosophic Clermont (Bussy’s fraternal avenger) and the upright magisterial Chabot would attain the almost Ulyssean status of “Senecal” men (*Revenge*, 4.4.42) -- defined by Michael Higgins as Christian or “baptized” Stoics⁹⁴ -- the displaced warriors Bussy and Byron, I shall argue, retain an Achilleian dissidence and thereby a sustained Essexian subtext. Chapman’s neoclassical remodeling of the Essex analogy in *Bussy*, which reifies the posthumous Essex as an Elizabethan exemplum in an antiheroic Jacobean milieu, anticipates *Byron*’s inexorable path toward conflict with the Crown.

4. Bussy: the King’s scourge

Bussy D’Ambois dramatizes the ignominious murder in 1579 of famed French swordsman (in every sense) Louis de Clermont d’Ambois, Seigneur de Bussy, allegedly at the instigation of Henri III’s brother, Monsieur, his rival in love to the Comtesse de Montsoreau (Tamyra in Chapman’s play). The scandal, which was common currency in London at the time, where Monsieur (better known as the Duc d’Anjou) was courting Queen Elizabeth, had presumably lost its toxicity in the intervening decades. Seeking in vain for the literary source that initiated Chapman’s dramatic move into contemporary French history when the staging of English history was coming under official scrutiny,

⁹³ Millar MacLure, *George Chapman: A Study* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1966), 110.

⁹⁴ Michael Higgins, "The Development of the 'Senecal Man'. Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* and Some Precursors," *The Review of English Studies* 23.89 (1947), 29.

the play's editors overlook the key Essex-implicated theatrical events of 1602 that must have influenced the play's conception: the self-suppressed *Troilus* and, even more dramatically, the execution of Duc de Biron on 31 July.

The Biron trial was a theatrical sensation on both sides of the channel, not least because of its parallel with execution of Essex, his military counterpart, eighteen months earlier. "There is no news on the stage, but that of the Marshal de Biron," wrote Sir Robert Drury to Cecil from Paris,⁹⁵ and London's theaters were no different. At the Rose, Henslowe was predictably quick to exploit the sensation, ordering a "blacke sewt of satten" and a "scafowld" for a play about "berowne."⁹⁶ (Perhaps the Chamberlain's Men also remounted *Love's Labour's Lost* featuring a younger, though equally defiant, Berowne.⁹⁷) Meanwhile, pamphlets such as *A Trew and Perfect Discourse of the Practises and Treasons of Marshall Biron*, demanding "pardon and not justice" for the recalcitrant yet penitent military hero were circulating on London's streets within weeks.⁹⁸ Prohibited from directly exploiting the Essex analogies inherent in these events, Chapman, I suggest, compounded Achilles and Byron within Bussy to create a

⁹⁵ In his letter of Sept 28 1602, Drury continues, "statesmen justify the King, but the multitude speak very ill of his proceeding"; his comments are recorded in PRO SPD 12/285. For details of the English reaction to Byron's death, see Glen Mynott, "'We Must Not Be More True to Kings / Than Kings Are to Their Subjects': France and the Politics of the Ancient Constitution in Chapman's *Byron Plays*," *Renaissance Studies* 9.4 (1995), 477-80.

⁹⁶ *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R.A. Foakes (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), 217. For the political analogy between Shakespeare's comedy and the contemporary French court, see *Love's Labour's Lost*, ed. H.R. Woudhuysen, Arden 3 (London: Methuen, 2001), 66-70.

⁹⁷ For the political context of *Love's Labour's*, see Hugh M. Huntington, "Shakespeare's Navarre," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 42.3 (1979), 193-216; and Louis Montrose, *"Curious-Knotted Garden": The Form, Themes, and Contexts of Shakespeare's 'Love's Labour's Lost'* (Salzburg: Universitat Salzburg, 1977), 67-90.

⁹⁸ *A Trew and Perfect Discourse of the Practises and Treasons of Marshall Biron, together with the particulars of his arraignment and execution* (London, 1602), 7.

neoclassical figure of epic proportions, a mythic Greek statue enlivened with the spirits of recently deceased political figures reborn in the body not of a phoenix but of seventeen-year-old actor Nathan Field, leading player of the Children of the Queen's Revels.⁹⁹

Despite their various ages and nationalities, the resemblances between Essex, Bussy, and Biron must have proved irresistible to Chapman and to his new Blackfriars audience. "Fortune's proud mushroom[s] shot up in the night" (3.1.117), they were all men of ancient stock and high valor who ultimately paid the price for having "perch[ed] too near the crown" (3.2.143). In the opening scenes of *Bussy* Chapman alerts the audience to the Essex-Achilles subtext and to its operation within the concurrent Elizabethan-Jacobean time scheme that functions throughout the play. The Bussy who first appears in his "green retreat" (1.1.45), contrary to his urbane real-life counterpart,¹⁰⁰ is withdrawn, destitute, and recklessly radical: "A man of spirit beyond the reach of fear," says Monsieur, "Who (discontent with his neglected worth) / Neglects the light and loves obscure abodes" (1.1.45-47). No peasant-born Tamburlaine preparing to turn the universe upon its head, the young aristocratic warrior has himself been overthrown: "Fortune, not

⁹⁹ Although *Byron*'s production history was obscured by the play's suppression, it is probable Field took the title role that Chapman wrote for him. Arguably, then, Field replaced Burbage as the theatrical avatar for the posthumous Essex. Despite Shakespeare's complaint via Hamlet that the boy actors of the Blackfriars, at the behest of playwrights like Jonson, were railing themselves out of business when they could no longer "sing," i.e., when their voices broke (*Hamlet* 2.2.343-49), Field was clearly a young man, and there is good reason to suppose that his fellow actors were adolescents rather than, say, the choristers of Paul's, with whom playwrights like John Lyly worked. While the Blackfriars Boys performed satirical work for, and often aimed at, gentlemen audiences, and Chapman was intent on producing his work in a setting receptive to his factional material, his tragedies offer no evidence of attempts to exploit the temporal tension of placing topical satire in the mouths of babes. I would argue, rather, that Chapman did the young men the honor of entrusting them with his, and their, first tragedy.

¹⁰⁰ For details of the historical Bussy, see Parrott 543.

Reason, rules the state of things, / Reward goes backwards, Honour on his head” (1.1.1-2). Recuperated by Monsieur, who seeks out the “resolved spirit” (1.1.43) for nefarious ends -- “There’s but a thread betwixt me and a crown” (1.1.40) -- Bussy willingly embraces a short, heroic life rather than a protracted peaceful one: “men that fall low must die, / As well as men cast headlong from the sky” (1.1.141-42). Governed by passion and “th’Etna of his pride” (3.2.146), Bussy soon challenges three crowing courtiers to a duel. Recollecting the offstage fight, the Nuntius likens the combatant who had challenged Bussy to unarmed combat to Hector, Achilles’ rival. In his lifestyle and lifespan, his ethos and his epic proportions, Bussy, concludes Elias Schwartz, “is modeled not on the Stoic self-sufficient man, but on Homer’s Achilles.”¹⁰¹ And the educated, radicalized Blackfriars audience, many of whom, notes Michael Shapiro, “shared the impulses that drove Essex to defy the Queen,”¹⁰² must have been receptive to the parallel with the recently executed rebel.

In a time-tumbling second scene, however, Chapman, following the impulse of the Essex balladeers, effects a reconciliation between Bussy-Essex and Elizabeth by drawing discomfiting parallels between the courts of James and Henri IV. Over the inevitable game of chess, the main court players -- a rather anodyne Henry III, the jealous factionalist Duke of Guise, and politic toady Montsurry -- favorably compare the English court to its French counterpart, which, Henry concedes, “is a mere mirror of confusion to it (1.2.27). Chapman’s ‘confused’ reflection becomes temporal as well as geographic

¹⁰¹ Elias Schwartz, “Seneca, Homer, and Chapman’s *Bussy D’Ambois*,” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 56.2 (1957), 172.

¹⁰² Michael Shapiro, *Children of the Revels: The Boy Companies of Shakespeare’s Time and Their Plays* (New York: Columbia UP, 1977), 96.

when the Guise, dismissing the English court fashion of the late 1570s, seems to refer to a more immediate period:

... it is too crest-fall'n
In all observance, making demigods
Of their great nobles, and of their old queen
An ever-young and most immortal goddess.
(*Bussy* 1.2.10-13)

The only “demigod” in the “old” Queen’s court of the 1590s -- the emblematic son of King Peleus and the nymph Thetis -- was Essex-Achilles, united here in a version of immortality with his Queen. Later in the scene, envious courtiers twice mistake Bussy for a “knight of the new edition” and “some new denizen lord” (1.2.123, 172). These anachronistic allusions to James’s wholesale creation of knights following his accession in 1603 (characteristic of the time-tampering exploited by Hayward in his dramatic historiography) are more than satirical indicators of the brevity of James’s honeymoon period south of the border. As France becomes proxy for Scotland, so the Elizabethan-Bourbon parallel of the 1570s incorporates a subversive Elizabethan-Jacobean critique in which the Scottish court, so Montsurry prophecies, “shall imitate, / (Though afar off) the fashions of [the French] Courts” (1.2.39-40), both in attire and in the politics of Valois absolutism: “Where the king’s change doth breed the subject’s terror / Pure innovation is more gross than error” (1.2.36-37). Shapiro notes that much of the younger English aristocracy under James, their power devalued by the influx of Scottish knights, were beginning to “[look] back on Essex as a champion of the traditional nobility against the

arbitrary exercise of royal power.”¹⁰³ Energized by cultural nostalgia and political anxiety, the posthumous Essex was, in effect, being radicalized.

Bussy-Achilles-Essex is a richly ambiguous triform figure that expresses both Chapman’s factional revisionism and his post-factional vision. Bussy’s tragedy is the product of political naïveté born of an overweening, ardently heterosexual, ego. Aware that serving the effete Monsieur is tantamount to servicing him -- “He’ll put his plow into me, plough me up” (1.2.123) -- Bussy deludes himself into thinking that he can retain his integrity and, presumably, his honor: “I am for honest actions, not for great: / If I may bring up a new fashion, / And rise in court for virtue, speed his [Monsieur’s] plough” (1.2.128-30). He is attracted to court not by a lust for power but by his overpowering lust, and he flirts dangerously with the Duchess of Guise in front of her husband simply because he can: “I’ll court her in despite of him” (1.2.155). His impressive physical virtues -- the Homeric *areté* that “denotes the strength and skill of a warrior or sportsman”¹⁰⁴ -- prove puny, however, in the face of Monsieur’s Machiavellian *virtù*. Turning outrage to advantage, Monsieur discerns in Bussy’s affair with Tamyra his rival’s Achilles’ heel; when the cunning hart “rutteth with his hind, / The place is mark’d, and by his ventry / He still is taken” (3.2.164-66). Using as a stale Tamyra’s body, Monsieur lures Bussy into the open where an offstage hand shoots him in the back.

Such an inglorious end to a tawdry adulterous affair encourages ethically minded critics to condemn “the great but not good” Bussy as one of Chapman’s “bestial servant[s] of self-love” who expresses “the frailty and fate of the natural man without true

¹⁰³ Shapiro, *Children of the Revels* 96.

¹⁰⁴ Schwartz, “Seneca, Homer, and Chapman’s *Bussy D’Ambois*,” 172. As Ide points out, *areté* forms the root of “aristocracy,” 169.

learning and religion.”¹⁰⁵ Yet viewing Bussy’s tragedy entirely as a moral failure is reductive, for Chapman’s portrayal of his adulterers is strikingly non-judgmental. Albeit illicit, the love between Bussy and Tamyra is also genuine. Indeed, her Friar acts as pander because, unlike her craven husband, who would sacrifice his wife to Monsieur’s *droit de seigneur*, Bussy “know[s] her worths and virtues” (2.2.137), and he answers her inadvertent summons to an ambush not because he can but because he must: “My motion must be rebel to my will, / My will to life” (5.3.72-73). In contrast to the relations between the iniquitous courtiers, and perhaps anticipating the cross-cultural romance between Shakespeare’s Antony and Cleopatra, the affair between Tamyra and Bussy seems not pure, but right.

However, as Ide argues, *Antony and Cleopatra* (1607), written four years after *Bussy* (though published in the same year), continues Shakespeare’s essentially “reactionary” relationship to Chapman.¹⁰⁶ Shakespeare’s fading Queen and obsolete General transcend their public and theatrical roles, crossing the generic rubicon to find romance in historical tragedy, whereas Bussy -- like Philotas, Byron, and Coriolanus, the Jacobean stage figures with Essexian undertones -- is driven by martial displacement rather than marital liaisons. Accordingly, Bussy’s ungovernable passion has a presiding political function, in that his loyalty to Tamyra is a personal gauge of his political allegiance to his King. Bussy initially sets himself in Achilleian opposition to his monarch: “Who to himself is law, no law doth need, / Offends no law, and is a king

¹⁰⁵ For these two opinions, see Charlotte Spivak, *George Chapman* (New York: Twayne, 1967), 116, and Ennis Rees, *The Tragedies of George Chapman: Renaissance Ethics in Action* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1954), 28 and 50.

¹⁰⁶ Ide 130-33.

indeed” (2.2.202-3). Yet Henry is surprisingly sanguine in the face of what Higgins calls this “vein of classical republicanism.”¹⁰⁷ Secure in the knowledge that he reigns over an unremittingly fallen world, Henry agrees that “Kings had never borne / Such boundless empire over other men / Had all maintain’d the spirit and state of D’Ambois” (3.2.95-97). He sees in the prelapsarian Bussy, raised in the “world of Saturn,” (3.2.106) the spirit of Hercules, a demigod more primitive and politically naïve than Achilles, and commensurately more useful.

A Stoic idealization drawn largely from Seneca’s plays *Hercules Furens* and *Hercules Oetaeus*, the Renaissance Hercules fuses humanitarian benefaction with martyrdom to become, according to Eugene M. Waith, “the supreme example of greatness of soul, of steadfastness, of scorn of fate and circumstance, of self-sacrifice. [...] Hercules amid the flames of Mount Oeta returns to the purity of nature -- to primal fire.”¹⁰⁸ So it is with Bussy. Secure in his own safety, Henry releases upon his rotten Court the scourge of Hercules, a cleansing force with avian qualities more violent than the Phoenix: “flatterers are kites / That check at sparrows; thou shalt be my eagle / And bear my thunder underneath thy wings” (3.2.3-5). Bussy will spare no one beneath the King -- not least Henry’s brother, whom he would happily “toss into the air” (4.1.96) -- yet ultimately he sacrifices only himself, or is sacrificed by his King: “A prince’s love is like the lightning’s fume, / Which no man can embrace but must consume” (3.1.132). In this post-Elizabethan world, the monarch has no intention of accompanying his turtle into the flames.

¹⁰⁷ Higgins 27.

¹⁰⁸ Eugene M. Waith, *The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden* (New York: Columbia UP, 1962), 31.

Bussy's tragic realization that his melodramatic life has barely touched the political matter of the play -- "let my death / Define nothing but a courtier's breath" (5.4.83-84) -- renders his dying, in MacLure's words, "superbly irrelevant to the world through which he has flashed."¹⁰⁹ But his obliteration is also magnificent, even inspirational. Refusing to die lying down, in his last moments Bussy becomes monumental -- "I am up here / like a Roman statue! I will stand / Till death hath made me marble" (5.4.94-96) -- before exploding into the firmament. In lines translated directly from *Hercules Oetaeus* the spectral Friar eulogizes over Bussy's body:

Farewell, brave relics of a complete man,
 Look up and see thy spirit made a star;
 Join flames with Hercules, and when thou sett'st
 Thy radiant forehead in the firmament,
 Make the vast crystal crack with thy receipt,
 Spread to a world of fire, and the aged sky,
 Cheer with new sparks of old humanity.

(Bussy 5.4.146-52)

Bussy's second death -- he is, in a sense, resurrected at the play's opening -- possesses more "humanity" than the life that preceded it.

Over the course of the play Chapman engineers an analogical metamorphosis that de-factionalizes the central character. Stripping out the Achilleian DNA to create a new Bussy-Hercules-Essex triform, Chapman transforms the apotheosis of factionalism in Homer and Shakespeare into Seneca's paradigm of Stoic fortitude and self-sacrifice.¹¹⁰ Monsieur fears Bussy precisely because he is "a spirit rais'd without a circle" (3.2.365), a rogue -- and therefore demonized -- element within the political system. In effect,

¹⁰⁹ MacLure 115 and 125.

¹¹⁰ "Though his savage anger is at times almost brutal," writes Waith, the Senecan Hercules "is capable of great devotion, is dedicated to a heroic ideal, and is regarded as a benefactor of humanity" 38.

Chapman stages Essex and his faction's central defense against treason, namely that the uprising intended only that "such men" as Cecil, Cobham, and Raleigh, who were plotting his assassination, "should be removed from the Queen's ear."¹¹¹ As Essex is made to say in the words of one of the many post-execution ballads in which he is resurrected: "I was ne'er against my countries right, / Nor to my queen was ever foe."¹¹² To be sure, as an apology the play concedes that the Herculean Essex was outmaneuvered by wilier political foes, but in his refusal to die lying down, or even to die outright, his humanity sparkling in the firmament, Bussy also poses a challenge to the post-Essexians. The "Umbra" Friar, his heart stopped by the "killing spectacle" (5.4.133) of Tamyras's tortured body, the spirit of Behemoth conjured by Bussy, the allusive analogues to the half-mortal figures of Achilles and Hercules, are more than Senecan spectacles. Like the "living spirits" in *The Shadow of Night* who shun "the cruel light of day [for] soft shades of sable funeral," these all-seeing ghosts remind us of the posthumous Essex and his uncompleted labor: "Fall Hercules from heaven in tempestes hurld, / And cleanse this beastly stable of the world" (*Shadow of Night*, "Noctet," 288-91, 255-56). Preaching to the disaffected Blackfriars audience, *Bussy* reasserts Essex's call to purge the evil advisors and "corrupte orators" of Elizabeth's government as the ultimate act of loyalty to James.¹¹³

¹¹¹ Spedding, 9:204.

¹¹² "A Lamentable new Ballad," ll.62-63 in Evans 3:92.

¹¹³ According to contemporary reports following the rebellion, Essex described Cecil, Cobham, and Raleigh as his "greate enemyes" whom he "had resolved to have removed from her Majestie as altogether unfytte to lyve so neere her, beinge corrupte orators of the now corrupted state"; British Library, Sloane collection, 756, fol.7v; cited in Hammer, "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 60.2 (2009), 31.

Of course, as Shapiro argues, the aspirants that comprised the Blackfriars audience in 1604 were not all disaffected; those on the way up were invested in supporting the new regime.¹¹⁴ With its Essexian subtext and half-formed republican sentiments, *Bussy* must have generated anxiety as well as empathy, especially as so many of the ‘big beasts’ that had condemned Essex in 1601 remained in control of the Privy Council.¹¹⁵ It is striking, therefore, that Daniel was prepared to license the play, more so that Buc or Cecil refrained from censoring it.¹¹⁶ Yet in 1603-4, James’s inaugural year, the post-Essex faction had its best opportunity to reassert itself at court. In a spirit of reconciliation the King publicly recuperated all the major players who had survived the Essex rebellion: Southampton and Hayward were freed from the Tower; Rutland’s crippling fines were reduced; and the young third Earl of Essex, also Robert, enjoyed full restitution of his rank and title, as well as the companionship of Henry, Prince of Wales. “[T]o repay a political debt, to pacify the vengeful survivors, and to appease the masses

¹¹⁴ Shapiro, *Children of the Revels*: 67-101.

¹¹⁵ The obvious losers were Raleigh and Cobham who, along with Lord Grey of Wilton, were accused of supporting a twin Catholic conspiracy -- the Main and Bye Plots -- to replace James with the Catholic Lady Arabella Stuart. Following show trials, both men were jailed in the Tower. Raleigh was executed in 1616; Cobham released two years later to die in poverty.

¹¹⁶ Although the Q1 flyleaf claims that *Bussy* was “often played at Paules” (a Boy’s company without a theater), Nathan Field created the title role in 1604 strongly suggests that the Queen’s Revels launched the play, which was only removed in 1606 by a disaffected sharer, Edward Kirkham. As such, I agree with Munro, 136, and Tricomi, “The Dates of the Plays of George Chapman,” *ELR* 12 (1982), 252-5, that *Bussy* should be considered the first of the contentious plays licensed by Samuel Daniel that ultimately lost him his post at the Blackfriars.

who had idolized Essex,” writes Vernon F. Snow, appreciating James’s canny *virtù*, “the new monarch endeared himself to the attainted heir.”¹¹⁷

Any sense of political invulnerability, however, was short-lived. While Cecil publicly brokered young Essex’s ill-fated match with the Catholic Lady Frances Howard, he worked behind the scenes to suppress the old Essex vanguard reforming around Southampton. And James’ indulgence began to evaporate as his brand of paternal absolutism faced resistance invariably tinged with a nexus of Elizabeth-Essex nostalgia. The royal academy intended to prepare the Prince and his fellow aristocrats for governance was increasingly viewed with suspicion as it evolved into a “shadow Court” infiltrated by old Essexians like John Florio and Sir Henry Savile, while, under their neglected royal patroness, the Children of the Queen’s Revels became a hothouse of anti-court sentiment and pro-Essex nostalgia. By 1607, the year Chapman composed *Byron*, optimism among the posthumous Essexians had all but evaporated. Over the previous two years, the boys had lost their patroness, their licenser, and, during Chapman’s incarceration for *Eastward Ho!*, their chief playwright. A year later, they would also lose the Blackfriars. In the face of such profound loss, on one level at least, *Byron* sounds a requiem for the dying Essex faction.

5. Byron: the scourge of kings

Were Bussy and Byron not such rampant individualists they would be brothers-in-arms. Like Bussy, Byron is a soldier overthrown by “sensual peace” since “breathless

¹¹⁷ Vernon F. Snow, *Essex the Rebel: The Life of Robert Devereux, the Third Earl of Essex: 1591-1646* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1970), 21.

war hath sheathed his sword and wrapped his ensigns up” (*Tr.* 1.2.5-15). As disinclined as Bussy to “trust [his] blood in others’ veins” (*Con.* 1.2.140), Byron valorizes “the free-born powers of royal man” over “those mere politic terms / Of love [and] loyalty” (*Con.* 3.1.27-31), and he asserts his aristocratic entitlement to place what little faith he has in friendship over fealty: “I build not outward nor depend on props, / Nor choose my consort by the common ear, / Nor by the moonshine in the grace of kings” (*Con.* 3.2.229-31). Byron also shares Bussy’s rich use of neoclassical similes from Homer and Seneca: Paris venturing from the gates of Troy (*Con.* 5.1.4-14); Menelaus taking on Ilion single-handed (*Con.* 2-1-151-53); Hercules trapped in the “dark light” of disfavor (*Tr.* 5.4.69-72);¹¹⁸ “As an unmatched Achilles in the wars” (*Tr.* 1.1.78).

Especially in the censored text, the duplex figure of Achilles-Hercules, the furious scourge, is the trace element that sustains the spirit of Essex throughout the *Byron* narrative. Just prior to recalling the condemned Earl’s refusal to beg his Queen’s forgiveness, Byron, hearing of the death of his horse Pastrana, once again self-identifies with “The matchless Earl of Essex, [whose] horse likewise that very hour / He suffered death, being well the night before, / Died in his pasture” (*Tr.* 4.1.133-38). Byron seems here to equate Essex’s downfall with Chapman’s Homeric recollection of Achilles’ horse Xanthus who, given power of speech by Juno, warns his master that “not farre hence the fatall minutes are / Of thy grave ruine” (*Iliad*, 19:394-95).¹¹⁹ In a rich intertextual skein

¹¹⁸ For these first two allusions and a discussion of the heroic figures throughout *Byron*, see Florby 70-79.

¹¹⁹ Margeson finds neither an historical nor a popular source for a similar equine event in Essex’s life, 215 and 280.

that, to use Florby's terms, spreads horizontally as well as vertically,¹²⁰ Chapman's adjectival fusion of the "unmatched Achilles" and the "matchless Essex" reverberates in Henry's earlier paeon to the "matchless queen" Elizabeth (*Tr.* 3.2.275). The analogically sophisticated Byron figure has the capacity, it seems, to accommodate all prior homologues -- Achilles, Hercules, Elizabeth, Essex, Bussy -- in a multifaceted paradigm that is both nostalgic and aggressively topical.

And yet, compared to Bussy or indeed to Daniel's hero Philotas, Byron is an unattractive and disturbing figure. Following the opening scene, in which he is a signatory to the 1598 Treaty of Vervins that concludes France's "uncivil, civil wars" with Spain (*Prologus* 1), Byron spends most of *The Conspiracy* fielding increasingly tempting offers from Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, Savoy (head of a small Duchy in the western Alps), and Count Fuentes, commander of the Spanish forces in Italy, all excited by a potential land-grab. Reveling in his dubious reputation as the "richest prize in Europe" (*Con.* 1.2.165), Byron seems oblivious to his increasingly treasonous reputation in Paris, where an indulgent Henry persists in seeking his Knight Marshal's service in securing France's fragile borders. Through the friendship of La Fin Byron is drawn into suspect negotiations with Savoy, for whom he promises to have carved into the cliff of Mount Oros "my face and all my lineaments; / And every man shall say, this is Byron" (*Con.* 3.2.165-66). Byron replaces Bussy's marmoreal splendor with the egotistical absurdity of a monumental *momento mori* to his treachery. Spivak's assertion that "One is never in doubt as to Tamburlaine's intentions; one is never quite sure of Bussy's" seems better

¹²⁰ "In Florby's terminology, 'vertical layers are marked by 'text' and 'intertext'," while horizontal layers align with the "'cultural texts' of Chapman's days," *Echoing Texts* 16-17.

applied to the Bussy/Byron relationship.¹²¹ Bussy is motivated by his desire to cleanse courts and copulate, a relatively straightforward, if potent, mix of ideology and biology. Byron, conversely, is not “much inclined to women” (1.1.66-67): the nature and object of his lusts is an ambiguous mix of vainglory, political indignation, and, according to Shapiro, an Oedipal desire to best his paternal monarch.¹²² Byron is Bussy metastasized, made grotesque by suspect motivations, a schizophrenic personality that “alters every minute” (*Tr.* 5.3.188), and mendacity bordering on self-delusion (or self-delusion bordering on mendacity; we simply cannot be sure).

As scenes shift between Brussels, Paris, London, Dijon, and the French-Italian border, Chapman enhances the sense of Byron as a feudal anachronism stalking across the coalescing map of early modern Europe by exposing his classical demigod for the first time to trenchant Tacitean scrutiny.¹²³ In Chapman’s earlier abstracted history, Bussy is lured from his “green retreat” into a Jacobean court of dark corridors, secret vaults, and spectral visitations. In *Byron*, Chapman takes his history seriously, treating Grimeston much as Shakespeare treats Holinshed, compressing or reshuffling events to serve the play’s ideational investigation of fortune versus virtue against a backdrop of

¹²¹ Spivak’s opinion characterizes moralistic interpretations of Bussy’s adultery by mid-twentieth century scholars, 113.

¹²² Shapiro notes this common Oedipal trope amid the “rivalries in the children’s city comedies” (98-99).

¹²³ Although Chapman never acknowledges Tacitus, the likelihood that he was the “second Pen [who] had a good share” in Jonson’s lost Q1 *Sejanus* implies his thorough working knowledge of the Roman historian. See “To the Readers,” *Sejanus his Fall* (London, 1605) in *Ben Jonson*, eds C H Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford: OUP, 1954). For Chapman’s co-authorship, see *Sejanus*, ed. Jonas A. Barish (New Haven: Connecticut: Yale UP, 1965), 4:22-24.

temptation and conspiracy.¹²⁴ In *Byron*'s politic landscape "shadows" and "discontented spirits" (*Con.* 1.1.16 & 95) are no longer ghosts but spies; "service [has become] rustic misery, [...] servile loyalty [a] decession of nature" (*Con.* 1.2.86-94); and "great affairs [are] forged / But upon anvils that are lined with wool" (*Tr.* 1.2.53-54). In a world of ambassadors tasked with penetrating "the heart and marrow of [a] king's designs" (*Con.* 1.1.7-8) all language is doublespeak, character is a cipher, and the ruler is the best decoder. "Your majesty hath with the greatest life / Described a wicked man," admires Savoy (himself a flatterer) of Henry's evisceration of La Fin, "or rather thrust your arm down through him to his very feet / And plucked his insides out" (*Con.* 1.1.165-69). In the new political reality true character is revealed through disembowelment, the traitor's fate.

Within this unstable linguistic milieu meaning becomes a matter of interpretation and a potent seductive tool. "Your wit is of the true Pierian spring / That can make anything of anything," Henry responds to Savoy's "doctrinal and witty hieroglyphic" of Byron's political synergy with his horse -- "The one commanding / And no way being moved, the other serving / And no way being compelled" (*Con.* 2.2.74-85). Yet while Byron welcomes honeyed assurance that he "persuade[s] as if [he] could create" (*Con.* 3.1.64-66), he proves a hopeless judge of character -- his "most trusted friend" La Fin emerges as the "lord intelligencer" who condemns him (*Tr.* 1.2.72; 5.4.196) -- and an inept reader of events and his place within them. At his initial entrance he is tempted to

¹²⁴ For instance, Savoy's French visit is both brought forward by a year and split so that his temptation of Byron opens *The Conspiracy* and his submission under the withering banter of three courtesans loyal to Henry closes it. A brief war between Savoy and France is also excised to underscore Byron's peacetime redundancy. For details, see Florby 21-36.

walk upon a carpet “spread [with] the history of Catiline / That earth may seem to bring forth Roman spirits / Even to his genial feet” (*Con.* 1.2.15-17). Condemned by both Tacitus and Sallust,¹²⁵ Catiline was a particularly destructive “Roman spirit” and failed conspirator, so the fetishistic excitement Byron feels rising through his feet is both ironic and weird: “I stand on change / and shall dissolve in changing; ‘tis so full / Of pleasure not to be contained in flesh” (*Con.* 27-29).

An ancient Roman stranded in Chapman’s Tacitean topography, Byron is incapable of reading the implication in the carpet because he pre-dates its historiography. His bemused first line, “What place is this? What air? What region?” (*Con.* 1.2.23), articulates his sense of displacement. Translating directly from Seneca’s *Hercules furens*, Chapman once again conjures the demigod, although, as Florby points out, “this is not Hercules at his best, [but] Hercules who has lost his mind.”¹²⁶ Further into his rhapsody, Byron rehearses the cosmic symbology of Bussy’s farewell: “like the shaft / Shot at the sun by angry Hercules / And into shivers by the thunder broken / Will I be if I burst” (*Con.* 1.2.40-43). But the Herculean labor to which Byron refers, driving the cattle of Geryon from Tartessus, is a hopeless failure,¹²⁷ and the “hyperbolic strain” he reaches for

¹²⁵ Whether Chapman went to Tacitus’ *Agricolo* or Sallust’s *Conspiracy of Catiline*, which Tacitus admired (*The Annales of Cornelius Tacitus. Translated by Richard Grenway* [London, 1598], 3:30), the conspiracy was a natural subject for politic historiography, prompting Jonson to write *Catiline* (1611) as a companion piece to his Tacitean *Sejanus*. It fared no better on the public stage than its predecessor.

¹²⁶ Florby (39-41) also notes Shakespeare’s use of the line to mark King Lear’s emergence from madness: “Where have I been? Where am I? Fair delight?” (4.7.52).

¹²⁷ Hercules found stealing the cows from the three-headed six-legged Geryon for his tenth labor rather simpler than transporting the herd from the island of Erythia (near modern day Libya) back to Greece; they were attacked and variously scattered by dogs, herdsman and gadfly: Perseus Digital Library, ed. Gregory R. Crane. Tufts University. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu> (accessed May 19 2012).

sounds “desperate and mad” (which, Braden admits, “is how a speaker of Senecan rhetoric comes across if his rhetoric fails to carry the day”¹²⁸). Deaf to these ominous intertexts, Byron is simultaneously blind to the political context, dramatically realized as the tempter Picoté -- a double agent working for the Archduke of Austria -- watches Byron from the wings, while both are spied upon from the balcony by Roiseau, Henry’s man in Brussels. (In Chapman’s fluid and volatile geo-political landscape countrymen are rarely compatriots.) Unaware of the surveillance around him and oblivious to the designs beneath him, Byron is revealed as a political illiterate incapable of reading from the Machiavellian manual.

Byron’s persistent denials of his conspiratorial activities might “verge on the psychopathic,” as Shapiro claims,¹²⁹ but they are also genuine, the rationale of a deluded individualist. Whether in this new political reality the scourge for kings has become the scourge of kings, or perhaps of one King, is as uncertain as Byron’s motivation. At one point Byron concedes to having “crossed’ [Henry’s] will a little” only where it “checked [his] free nature and [his] honour” (*Tr.* 3.2.81-82); at another, he demands “the important citadel of Bourg” to challenge the royal prerogative (*Con.* 5.1.18); and elsewhere he characterizes himself as a kingmaker/breaker (“My father, all know, set him [Henry] in his throne, / And if he urge me, I may pluck him out” [*Tr.* 3.1.154-5]), a Stoic (“I will be mine own king [*Con.* 5.2.137]), and a radical Republican: “We must reform and have a new state / of creation and government” (*Tr.* 1.2.30). Yet when he comes close to confessing his treasonous ambitions, he cedes his fate to the actions of others, who will

¹²⁸ Braden 206.

¹²⁹ Shapiro 98

either “let [him] fall, or toss [him] up / Into the affected compass of a throne” (*Con.* 3.3.34-36). Rather than enact his ambitions, Byron flies kites on the hot air of his own vaunts.

Chapman repeatedly equates such ambiguous dissidence with Essex, who, even in the censored text, is tightly woven into this pattern of virtual treasons. Just as Essex was famously restrained from laying hand to weapon when cuffed by the Queen in 1598,¹³⁰ so Byron twice “*offers to draw*” against Henry (*Con.* 5.1.154; 5.2.28), but is restrained by his friend Auvergne (whose punishment is also equated to the Stoical Southampton’s lengthy confinement [*Tr.* 5.1.101-4]). The French conspirators’ cipher, “Collect your friends and stand upon your guard” (*Tr.* 3.1.118), echoes the English rebels’ famous password, “my Lord would stand upon his guard.”¹³¹ Byron’s vaunting “Who will stir / To tell authority that it doth err?” (*Tr.* 4.1.19-20) evokes Essex’s near-treasonous response to Lord Keeper Egerton’s advice to placate his Queen: “Cannot Princes erre? Can they not wrong their Subjects? Is any earthly power infinite? I can never subscribe to these principles.”¹³² And Byron’s defense at his trial, that Essex “yet was guilty, I am innocent: / He still refused grace, I importune it” (*Tr.* 5.3.146-47), rather reinforces the guilt he denies and the parallel he now attempts to sever. As Byron convicts himself through association with Essex, so Chapman condemns Essex by his theatrical affiliation with Byron. A political incompetent rather than a politic intriguer, more fantasist than visionary, the mighty neoclassical figure is finally brought low as he prepares to be

¹³⁰ William Camden, *Annals*, 3rd ed. (London, 1635), 493.

¹³¹ Quoted in Francis Bacon, “A Declaration of the Practices and Treasons Attempted and Committed by the Late Robert Earle of Essex and His Complices, against Her Majesty and Her Kingdoms” (London, 1601), D3^v.

¹³² Camden 494.

executed in the French manner: “Fall on your knees then, statists: [...] knees bent too late / Stick you in earth like statues” (*Tr.* 5.4.254-56). There is no afterlife in this farewell; Essex’s political memory is mortified.

There is, however, a didactic purpose behind Chapman’s uncompromising valediction. *Byron* is also a postmortem on the suppression of the posthumous Essex faction by the new political elite, and in this, I suggest, the play possesses the dangerous topicality that roused governments on both sides of the channel. While modern Italy and ancient Rome presented useful analogical models for writing on contemporary affairs, “modern France,” writes Tricomi, “has the unique advantage that it is a country much like England, but not England, with an established [heritage] of natural law and rights, [and a] feudal aristocracy, which upheld the rights of subjects against the claims of positive law.”¹³³ Where *Bussy*’s Elizabethan court fashions a nostalgic contrast to its sybaritic French counterpart, *Byron* collapses time to reinforce the close correspondence between the reigns of Henri IV in 1598 and James I ten years later. Both are lesser monarchs who have “grown into a greater kingdom” (*Con.* 1.1.119) upon which they impose new conditions, unpopular peace treaties, and absolute government for which, notes Mynott, they encounter “stern resistance from the nobility and legislature.”¹³⁴ The embodiment of enlightened absolutism, Chapman’s Henry is doubtless a model for James and, as Edward Kennedy points out, articulates many of his Scottish counterpart’s favorite maxims from *Trew Lawe*.¹³⁵ Indeed, Henry’s first speech, in which he promises

¹³³ Tricomi, *Anticourt Drama* 80.

¹³⁴ Mynott 486.

¹³⁵ Edward D. Kennedy, “James I and Chapman’s *Byron* Play,” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 64.4 (1965), 679.

that his court shall not be “a hive for drones” and that “Navarre shall be Navarre and France still France” (*Con.* 1.1.114-22), echoes James’s assurance to Parliament in March 1607 that England “will not bee overwhelmed by the swarming of the Scots.”¹³⁶ But Rees’ appraisal of Henry as “the most complete dramatic portrait of an ideal king” and Kennedy’s claim that “James would surely have approved of Chapman’s allusions to his doctrines” and to the favorable Bourbon parallel present partial and flawed readings of the play.¹³⁷

The bipartite structure of *Byron*, which was designed as a “theatrical unit” sharing one prologue,¹³⁸ operates not on Byron (whose tragedy begins the moment he steps upon the Catiline carpet in 1.2 of the *Conspiracy*) but on Henry; as doubts over his behavior in *The Conspiracy* are confirmed in *The Tragedy*, Henry’s humanism and ethics come under sharp scrutiny. Savoy’s valorization of Byron mocks Henry’s famed military exploits during the Wars of Religion, prompting the King’s petulant retort, “Was not I there?” (*Con.* 2.2.209-11): we later learn that for ten of the twelve major victories he was not (*Tr.* 1.1.103-5). When Henry accuses Byron of being “an atheist [...] and a traitor, / both foul and damnable” (*Tr.* 4.2.250-1), he rehearses his own politic conversion in 1593 when, in order to acquire the Catholic throne, he had led “a kings revolt / And play[ed] both ways with religion” (*Tr.* 3.1.45-6). Even the aging King’s reputed virility seems grotesque, as he mocks Savoy’s attempts to court three of his courtesans (*Con.* 5.2.120-22) while, like

¹³⁶ Quoted in Kennedy 680.

¹³⁷ Rees, *Tragedies of Chapman* 56, and Kennedy 681.

¹³⁸ G.K. Hunter, “*Henry IV* and the Elizabethan Two-Part Play,” *The Review of English Studies* 5.19 (1954), 238. Hunter’s argument that *Byron* “works out a tragic pattern of achievement and defeat in ten acts” (239) fails to describe what Byron achieves in *The Conspiracy*.

an old lion struggling to retain control of his pride, he publicly placates his wife and his chief mistress.

Although Henri and James's reputations for lax piety and loose morals were becoming common fodder for the Jacobean satirists, which doubtless made de la Boderie acutely sensitive to the inserted mistress fracas, Chapman exploits Henry's womanizing only insofar as it underscores his ideological critique of divinely-elected autocracy. I suspect, therefore, that what particularly aggravated both crowns to suppress *Byron* in March 1608 were the dishonorable and unscrupulous tactics with which Henry first entraps and then prosecutes Byron. Absolutism "as envisaged by Chapman in his French tragedies," writes Gilles Bertheau, is always "buttressed by Machiavellian discourses and practices."¹³⁹ In 1599 the French King warned his Parliamentarians: "I am better informed than you; whatever happens, I know what each of you will say. I know what is in your houses, I know what you are doing and everything that you say, for I have a little devil who reveals all to me."¹⁴⁰ Henry's "little devil" features prominently in *Byron*: "La Fiend, and not La Fin, he should be called" (*Con.* 3.2.226). From his theatrical banishment in the *Conspiracy* -- "[Thou] art the center to impiety. / Away and tempt me not" (*Con.* 1.1.161-62) -- to his dramatic redemption as "good La Fin" (*Tr.* 1.3.91) at the opening of the *Tragedy*, this alleged malcontent's relationship to Henry, always played out publicly, emerges as a staged cover for covert practices. In reality, La Fin is the

¹³⁹ Gilles Bertheau, "George Chapman's French Tragedies, or Machiavelli Beyond the Mirror," in *Representing France and the French in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Jean-Christophe Mayer (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 114.

¹⁴⁰ *Lettres Missives de Henri IV*, eds Berger de Xivrey and Jules Gaudet, 9 vols (Paris, 1843-76), cited in David Buisseret, *Henry IV: King of France* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1990), 77.

conduit through which Henry tempts Byron into a marital alliance with Savoy; he delivers the “fair letters,” or “golden pills” (3.1.118-19) that lure Byron back to Paris; and he is the “charmed [...] crystal” through which Henry discerns “by whom and what designs / [His] rule is threatened” (*Tr.* 1.1.98-100). Henry’s employment of *agents provocateur*, while not mitigating Byron’s political naiveté, reinforces our sense that France’s “politic king” (*Con.* 1.1.86) had learnt from the “schools [of] ingenious Italy [...] / To glide into degrees of height by craft” (*Tr.* 3.1.2-8). Chapman leaves the audience pondering the troubling irony that a system sanctioned by God should operate through secrecy and surveillance, the very tenets of “the devil [...] *Signor Machiavel*.”¹⁴¹

Where Byron’s entrapment is inscribed with the French King’s rhetoric of surveillance, his subsequent prosecution speaks to the developing constitutional crisis between the Jacobean crown and the legislature following the parliamentary address of 1607, in which James declared himself the final arbiter in the codification of England’s common laws preceding judicial union with Scotland.¹⁴² Amid increasingly tense negotiations between Whitehall and St James’s Palace on an issue that, according to Glen Mynott, threatened the very “basis of the ancient constitution upon which the rights of the king’s subjects were dependent,”¹⁴³ Chapman’s portrayal of the Jacobean Henry must have sounded a deeply provocative note. For Henry, justice is always a matter of political expediency. A symbol of the law rather than subject to it, Henry concedes only that the

¹⁴¹ Everard Guilpin, Satire 1, *Skialetheia, or a Shadow of Truth, in Certaine Epigrams and Satyres*, ed. D Allen Carroll (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1991), 61.

¹⁴² For a transcript of James’s speech, see *The Political Works of James I*, ed. Charles Howard McIlwain (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1918), 1:290-305.

¹⁴³ Mynott 487.

wise monarch should be seen to uphold justice lest his people “derive their springs / From their base precedents, copied out of kings” (*Tr.* 5.1.50-65). To ministers like Janin, however, “Princes [...] are masters of their laws” (*Tr.* 4.2.30), and the ends of state always justify the means: “the profit [...] commends the example” (*Tr.* 4.2.38). Henry initially rejects Janin’s advice to have Byron assassinated “Like Alexander with Parmenio” (*Tr.* 4.2.30) because “executions so informal” (*Tr.* 4.2.39) would reflect poorly upon his international reputation: “the world shall know my power / And my authority by law’s usual course” (*Tr.* 4.2.41-42).¹⁴⁴ Yet when the Peers of France refuse to appear at Byron’s arraignment Henry instates arbitrary justice at a sweep: “I [...] will no more endure / To have my subjects make what I command / The subject of their oppositions” (*Tr.* 5.1.96-98). Condemned on the hearsay of La Fin and tried by three Court-appointed judges instead of the legally required Council of Peers, Byron submits to a show trial whose result is foreordained. Behind the language of amity and magnanimity, Mynott comments, “the rhetoric of accusation and the ceremony of a public trial are the instruments of the modern state, which, Henry recognizes, can be used to legitimize the killing of Byron.”¹⁴⁵ How quickly even enlightened monarchy turns to arbitrary government when it is threatened from within, Chapman warns, echoing Essex’s

¹⁴⁴ Although Chapman rehearses Grimeston’s reference to Parmenio (968), the Blackfriars audience must have remembered the final scene of Daniel’s recent *Philotas*, in which the contrite Polidamas confesses to having assassinated Philotas’ father at Alexander’s draconian command.

¹⁴⁵ Mynott 489.

infamous complaint, “cannot princes err? cannot subjects receive wrong?”;¹⁴⁶ and the play’s subsequent suppression offers its own testimony.

Byron’s portrayal of the paradox of enlightened absolutism, in which the brilliant, charismatic, and pragmatic Henry is revealed as simultaneously hypocritical, devious, and brutal, suggests that Chapman, notwithstanding his repudiation of the posthumous Essex faction, still had political fire in his belly and some kind of factional resolve. Various scholars have proposed that *Byron*’s dedication to Walsingham, who had escorted Biron to London in 1602, camouflages Chapman’s real patron, Prince Henry.¹⁴⁷ Sewer-in-Ordinary to Henry since 1604 (a ceremonial post that brought more caché than cash), Chapman dedicated the 1609 edition of *The Iliad* to the “epitome of militant Protestant chivalry [and] spiritual heir” to Essex.¹⁴⁸ The *Complete Works of Homer*’s memorial inscription to the “Incomparable Heroe / Henrye Prince of Wales,” which supports the twin Columns of Hercules and which follows a title page protected by the flanking figures of Hector and Achilles, suggests that, within a year of the *Byron*

¹⁴⁶ This letter to Lord Keeper Sir Thomas Egerton followed a particularly vitriolic meeting of the Privy Council during the summer of 1598, in which Essex, having broken protocol by turning his back on his Queen, was struck on the head by Elizabeth and threatened to draw his sword. Questioning the very principles of divinely elected monarchy, Essex’s letter continues, “Is an earthly power or authority infinite? Pardon me, pardon me, my good Lord, I can never subscribe to these principles.” The letter is transcribed in G.B. Harrison, *The Life and Death of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex* (London: Cassell, 1937), 200-1.

¹⁴⁷ See Norma Dolbe Solve, “Stuart Politics in Chapman’s *Tragedy of Chabot*,” *University of Michigan Publications in Language and Literature* 4 (1928), 18; Margeson 2; Florby, *Echoing Texts*, 145; and Bertheau 120.

¹⁴⁸ Roy Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England’s Lost Renaissance* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1986), 14. Henry promised Chapman £300 and a life pension for his full translations of *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*. *The Complete Works of Homer* was published in 1616, four years after Henry’s death; Chapman, predictably unlucky in patronage, never received a penny. For details, see Buchtel 2-4.

contention, Chapman had transferred his allegiance, along with Essex's symbology, to Henry. Rather than being laid to rest, Essex's memory was rejuvenated in the young, dissenting figure of a Prince as much at odds with his father as Byron is with the paternalistic Henry.

Henry's counter court, variously described as "firmly anti-Catholic," "a center of opposition to the King," and "a site of an ambitious Elizabethan revival,"¹⁴⁹ exacerbated family tensions between a father who was jealous of his son and a Prince who obdurately resisted his King. Admired for his "great *virtù*" rather than his scholarly accomplishments,¹⁵⁰ Prince Henry, through his martial inclinations and expansionist ambitions in Europe and the New World, challenged both James and Henri's commitment to peaceful consolidation and political centralization. In their 1608 pamphlet "Arguments for Warre" the Prince's military advisors promote the benefits of warfare in pointedly Francophobe terms: "Our *Honour*, as the Stile of our Kings, by confluence of so many Titles increased; and by accession of so many territories as we held in *France*, our dominions and liberties so far enlarged [effects] this happy union of the *Britain Empire*."¹⁵¹ Coinciding with this provocative pamphlet, *Byron's* critique of Henry's recent pacifist policies, especially in (what survive of) Elizabeth's lines, smacks of confederacy:

¹⁴⁹ Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Oxford: OUP, 1981), 82; Kevin Sharpe, "Stuart Monarchy and Political Culture," in *Oxford Illustrated History of Tudor and Stuart Britain*, ed. John Morrill (Oxford: OUP, 1996), 247; and Curtis Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 166.

¹⁵⁰ Strong quotes the Venetian cleric Paolo Sarpi, 76.

¹⁵¹ Sir Robert Cotton, *An Answer Made by Command of Prince Henry, to Certain Propositions of Warre and Peace, Delivered to His Highness by Some of His Military Servants* (London, 1655), 3-4.

... tell your king that he neglects
Old friends for new, and sets his soothèd ease
Above his honour; marshals policy
In rank before his justice, and his profit
Before his royalty.

(*Conspiracy* 4.1.53-57)

If, then, Chapman was perceived as contributing to the reemergence of a militant yet heroic Protestantism, *Byron* was perhaps condemned not as an epilogue to the posthumous Essex but as a prologue to the post-Essex faction developing around Prince Henry.

Chapman's political philosophy, however, had evolved from the martial militancy of the 1598 *Iliad* and Bussy's magnificent yet destructive *furore*, and Henry's "sensual peace" is hardly more reprehensible than Byron's self-identification as Chaos, who, having "repair[ed his] country's ruin, / Will ruin it again to readvance it" (*Tr.* 1.2.34-35). Less concerned with the hawkish ambitions of the post-Essexians than with the "owly eye of politic and thankless royalty" (*Tr.* 5.2.182-82), Chapman synthesizes the political philosophies of his early poems with *Byron*'s Tacitean historiography to challenge the ethics and efficacy of systemic absolutism within the domestic sphere. Rather than encouraging overseas expansion, in other words, the play urges its audience to defend England's borders (northern *and* southern) from an ideological invasion. Such a politically motivated and reactionary agenda offers an intriguing interpretation of *Byron*'s second prohibition. Although the titillating "effeminate war" appears to have been an opportunistic insertion designed to cause maximum embarrassment to the French, I hypothesize that it too was destined for an English audience, although the particular auditor in question was currently overseas.

In the fall of 1607, during the period of *Byron*'s composition, the third Earl of Essex embarked on the Grand Tour and the final leg of his education. Married in name, if not in deed, to the Catholic Frances Howard, yet spiritual brother to the Protestant Prince Henry, Essex was only too aware of the political significance of his journey. "The eyes of the world are much upon you," wrote his teacher Joseph Hall, a Puritan preacher and satirist.¹⁵² Although he traveled mainly through the Protestant states of northern Europe, Essex twice visited Paris on his way to and from the battlefields of the Hundred Years War in the Loire Basin. Briefly introduced to the King in November 1607 by ambassador Sir George Carew, an old Essexian who had fought at Cadiz and the Azores, Essex was royally entertained on his return to Paris in early April 1608. At the Palace of Fontainebleau, an old fortress recently transformed into a grandiloquent expression of Henri's absolute power, the Continental champion of absolute monarchy feted the young Essex. From England's distant shores it might well have appeared that Essex *fills* was being wooed, seduced even, by his father's old friend and former brother-in-arms, Henri of Navarre.¹⁵³ I posit that, while Henri and Essex hunted stag in the Forest of Fontainebleau,¹⁵⁴ Chapman rapidly reworked his masque of Cupid "hawk[ing for] birds in Arden's groves" (*Tr.* 2.1.21), inserting a physical fight between Chastity (the Queen) and Liberality (D'Entragues) that subverts their staged "reconcilement" and mocks Henry's smooth conciliation. Beneath the ordered, enlightened surface, Chapman

¹⁵² "Advice for his Travels," in *The Works of the Right Reverend Joseph Hall*, 10 vols, ed. Phillip Wynter (Oxford: OUP, 1839), 7:146.

¹⁵³ Having fought with Navarre at the siege of Rouen in 1591, Essex continued to defend Henri even after his Catholic conversion and fall from Elizabeth's favor; see Buisseret 38.

¹⁵⁴ Snow, *Essex the Rebel* 37.

trumpets from across the Channel, there is something rotten in the state of France.

Whether or not Essex heard of the furor sparked by the double prohibition of a play in London in which his father featured so prominently, he felt compelled upon his departure from Paris to write Prince Henry a note reaffirming his loyalty: "I shall return an acceptable servant to your Highness."¹⁵⁵ Rejecting the baroque luxury of the French Court and the smooth policy of its courtiers, Essex returned to England "a man's man"¹⁵⁶ and the Prince's confirmed ally: Henri had failed to put his plough into him.

With the "effeminate war" entirely lost to the censor, any attempt to interpret the motives behind *Byron's* late addition remains conjectural. Yet the hypothesis that Chapman was consciously intruding upon sensitive issues of foreign policy and diplomacy would explain the extraordinary measures taken against the play. Indeed, Gondomar denounced Middleton's *A Game at Chess* (1624) -- the only other drama of the period suppressed by petition of a foreign ambassador -- for interfering in a similarly delicate foreign policy issue: the proposed marriage of Prince Charles to the Infanta Maria of Spain.¹⁵⁷ "James may have been comparatively lenient towards personal and Court satire," notes Clare, "but when plays impinged upon his foreign policy he was quick to respond."¹⁵⁸ Yet the Privy Council, presumably sensitive to the adverse publicity, was remarkably slow to respond to *A Game at Chess*, which ran for a record-breaking nine performances at The Globe before it was closed down. In striking contrast,

¹⁵⁵ Walter Bouchier Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex*, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1853), 2:234.

¹⁵⁶ Snow, *Essex the Rebel* 40.

¹⁵⁷ For details, see T.H. Howard-Hill, "Political Interpretations of Middleton's *A Game at Chess* (1624)," *Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991), 274-85.

¹⁵⁸ Clare 199.

Byron's rapid double suppression betrayed the Crown's extreme sensitivity to a play that not only equates Jacobean relations with France to an ideological annexation by foreign absolutism, but portrays a regenerated and rejuvenated circle of resistance to James forming around both the biological and spiritual successors to Essex: his son and the future Henry IX of England.

Conclusion

Although bloodied by a *Byron* affair that left him professionally homeless and politically marked, Chapman seems to have resumed his Homeric translations with the vigor of a writer elevated to chief spokesman of the nascent Henry-Essex faction. If so, Shakespeare was once again quick to react to his rival history player, filling the theatrical space left by *Byron* with *The Tragedy of Coriolanus* (1608-9), his first play for the Blackfriars and his most explicit dissection of the nation's body politic.¹⁵⁹ Following the 1601 rebellion, Bishop William Barlow had described the "discontented [Coriolanus] as a fit parallel for the late Earl of Essex,"¹⁶⁰ yet the despiser of the Roman commonwealth contrasts strikingly with the populist Essex of Shakespeare's *Henry IV* plays,¹⁶¹ and few scholars endorse Willet Titus Conklin's perceived homology between two men who "had

¹⁵⁹ Published only in Folio, *Coriolanus* is generally dated by topical events referred to in the text (the Corn Riots of 1607-8 and the 'leveling' idiom that infuses the language of the plebeians), by references either to other texts (not least Chapman's 1609 *Iliad*), or by other texts (Jonson's *Epicoene* [1610]); for details, see *The Tragedy of Coriolanus* ed. R.B Parker, Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 2-4.

¹⁶⁰ Millar MacLure discusses Barlow's sermon following the Essex rebellion in *The Paul's Cross Sermons* (Toronto: Toronto UP, 1958), 80-86.

¹⁶¹ Notably, Shakespeare redeploys the hat "vayling" trope describing Essex's common touch -- "Go to them, with this bonnet in thy hand" his mother, Volumnia, advises futilely, "And thy knees bussing the stones" (3.2.73-75) -- to demonstrate Coriolanus's loathing of the commonwealth and its members.

fought for [their] country, had been accused of mismanagement, had taken arms against the state, and had lost.”¹⁶² It seems unlikely, however, that the Blackfriars audience could have failed to connect Coriolanus to Byron, and through him to the inheritor of Essex’s “war men,”¹⁶³ Prince Henry. Much as the forty-year-old Biron (*Tr.* 1.1.5) was played by an actor half his age, so Shakespeare went beyond Plutarch to repeatedly stress Coriolanus’ “pupil age / Man-entered thus” (*Cor.* 2.2.98-99). “[W]e have to assume that Shakespeare meant to remind his audience,” writes Robin Headlam Wells, that seven years after the demise of Essex and his neo-chivalric values, “support was once more growing for the old heroic ideal, this time embodied in a charismatic young warrior in the making.”¹⁶⁴ In Shakespeare’s ultimate critique of the Essexian fantasy of the warrior politician (that had evolved from Sidney’s warrior poet) Coriolanus is “the beast-man apotheosized, both titanic and inhuman,” writes Ide, “at the same time Chapman’s hero and Shakespeare’s criticism of him.”¹⁶⁵ *Coriolanus* denounces the heroic values not of the Essex Shakespeare once knew, but of the magnificent egotist he had become in Chapman’s tragedies and the reckless hero he threatened to become under Henry.

Chapman never got the chance to respond to *Coriolanus* and continue the post-Essex dispute with Shakespeare. Pressing hard to fulfill his commission to complete his

¹⁶² Willet Titus Conklin, “Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*, and Essex,” *The University of Texas Bulletin: Studies in English* 11.3133 (1931), 44. Philip Brockbank, *Coriolanus*, Arden 2 (Methuen: London, 1975), 75, views any parallels as having “only a retrospective and accidental validity [that] testify nevertheless to the contiguity of past and present”; while P.A. Jorgensen, “Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus*: Elizabethan Soldier,” *PMLA* 70 (1949), 225-27, argues that Coriolanus’s “military dependency” applied to the “war party” in general.

¹⁶³ “An Apologie of the Earle of Essex,” A2^v, C1, and C1^v.

¹⁶⁴ Robin Headlam Wells, “‘Manhood and Chevalrie’: *Coriolanus*, Prince Henry, and the Chivalric Revival,” *The Review of English Studies* 51.203 (2000), 405.

¹⁶⁵ Ide 183.

Homeric translation, Chapman had his project tragically overtaken by the sudden death of the eighteen-year-old Henry from typhoid fever in 1612. Emotionally, financially, and ideologically bereft, Chapman turned his back on the neo-Essex-Henry circle and instead sought the patronage of factional adversary Robert Carr, James's favorite for whom Frances Howard had secured an annulment of her marriage to the young Essex on the grounds of his alleged impotence. In *Andromeda Liberata* (1613), an allegorical epithalamion commemorating the ill-fated marriage, "it is sad to say," writes Millar MacLure, "[Chapman] wrote himself down an ass."¹⁶⁶ In *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*, written the same year, the rational Clermont replaces his brother's furious scourge, choosing suicide over vengeance, the ultimate Stoic act, as an implicit rejection of the factional and political resolve of the earlier tragedies.

And yet Chapman's evisceration of royal tyranny in "this vile degenerate age" (*Chabot*, 1.1.16) continued unabated, and the monarchs of his subsequent French tragedies -- Henry III and Francis I -- are hopeless reprobates. Denied an aristocratic champion to reclaim England from continental absolutism, Chapman in his later dramas inched ever closer to the philosophical imperatives of classical republicanism. We can only wonder, then, how he felt as the 3rd Earl of Essex's extraordinary career unfolded. A disgraced son who had been first restored and then shamed by James for the sake of a favorite's marriage, Essex over time became "a living symbol" of opposition to the Crown, a close ally of Southampton, and a key military figure in the unholy alliance

¹⁶⁶ MacLure, *George Chapman*, 24. The poem's contentious conceit involves Andromeda (Lady Frances), having been bound to a rock (the 3rd earl of Essex) to be fed upon by a sea-monster (the multitude), being rescued by Perseus (Somerset). Compelled to defend himself against scandalous interpretation, Chapman published a furious *Justification* against the "vulgar *Voices* [of the] Plebeian"; see Bartlett, *Poems* 327.

between the House of Lords and the emerging *vox populi* in the Commons.¹⁶⁷ When, twenty years later, he commanded the army that brought down the Stuarts and ushered in Cromwell's commonwealth, both houses pledged, "to live and die with the Earl of Essex."¹⁶⁸ In *Byron*, I have argued, Chapman lays to rest the ghost of one Essex so as to usher in a new generation better equipped to challenge the Jacobean oligarchy. However brief the association, Chapman's *Byron* therefore possesses an extraordinary prescience and power: the rebel is dead, long live the rebel.

¹⁶⁷ Snow, "Aristocratic Opposition," 225; and W. Gordon Zeeveld, "*Coriolanus* and Jacobean Politics," *Modern Language Review* 57.3 (1962), 326.

¹⁶⁸ Snow, "Aristocratic Opposition" 233.

Conclusion

In one of his last letters to Queen Elizabeth, dated May 12, 1600, a wretched Essex turned his loathing upon the very authors he had recently patronized and employed in his self-promotional campaign of the late 1590s:

I am gnawed on and torn by the vilest and basest creatures upon earth. The prating tavern hunter speaks of me what he list; the frantic libeler writes of me what he list; already they print me and make me speak to the world, and shortly they will play me in what forms they list upon the stage.¹

At first glance this extraordinary diatribe seems to anticipate the condemned Essex's penitential and sanctimonious demeanor following the rebellion, when, according to Paul Hammer, his chaplain Abdias Assheton's "spiritual bludgeoning demolished Essex's sense of heroic failure [and] prompted an outpouring of critical evidence which helped to condemn friends and servants."² Bundled with the gossips and the balladeers, Essex condemns players and playwrights in language straight from the Puritan handbook. "The Gentlemen Players in the citie of London," thundered anti-theatrical polemicist Stephen Gosson, "are as ravenous wolves that have whetted their teeth to pull me downe."³ The final phrase in the excerpt from Essex's letter seems to suggest, moreover, that, at least as

¹ Essex's letter of May 12, 1600 is reproduced in Walter Bouchier Devereux, ed. *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex*. 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1853), 2:99.

² "Devereux, Robert, second earl of Essex (1565–1601)," Paul E. J. Hammer in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, October 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/view/article/7565> (accessed July 24, 2012).

³ Stephen Gosson, "Dedicatorie," A2^f, *Playes Confuted in Five Actions*, 1584 (New York: Garland, 1982).

far as he was concerned or was prepared to concede, he had yet to suffer the indignity of theatrical representation.

As is so often the case with Essex's pronouncements, however, while sentiment rowed one way, meaning could be found heading in the opposite direction.⁴ As Essex wrote to the Queen of his victimization by libelers, he concurrently sanctioned the leaking of his 1598 letter to Anthony Bacon, *An Apologie of the Earle of Essex*, which championed his status as leader of England's "men of warre."⁵ Although Essex predictably disowned this pirated edition when it was stopped at the printers, his crass self-promotion compelled the Privy Council to call the hearing of June 5, 1600 that initiated the final phase of his downfall.⁶ Poorly timed and ill advised, the "Apologie" was one of numerous, often unsuccessful, "self-figurations" following Cadiz, in which, notes Sophie Appelt, Essex felt "compelled to dispel misreadings and challenges" to his honor and his reputation.⁷ In February, Essex had been suspected of endorsing the reproduction, by "some foolish idle-headed ballade maker," of a Thomas Cockson engraving that represented him in regal pose on a rearing horse above a couplet praising

⁴ I refer again to Essex's letter to Edward Reynolds of 1596: "I must like the watermen rowe one way and look an other"; cited in Hammer, "'The Smiling Crocodile': The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan 'Popularity'," in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007), 98.

⁵ Robert Devereux, *An Apologie of the Earle of Essex* (London, c.1598), B3^v.

⁶ When questioned about the leaked document at the hearing, Essex contrived to blame his friend and cousin Fulke Greville; see Hammer, "The Earl of Essex, Fulke Greville, and the Employment of Scholars," *Studies in Philology* 91.2 (1994), 174.

⁷ Ursula Appelt, "Figuring Self through History: Essex and the Crisis of Images of Self," (unpublished paper), cited by Alzada Tipton in "The Transformation of the Earl of Essex: Post-Execution Ballads and 'the Pheonix and the Turtle'" *Studies in Philology* 99.1 (2002), 63

him as “God’s elected.”⁸ The prints were immediately suppressed and Essex threatened with the Tower. Even under house arrest Essex continued to orchestrate a public relations campaign to salvage his reputation, although his confinement and the Privy Council’s increased vigilance clearly thwarted his efforts.

In the context of this ongoing, if stuttering, campaign, Essex’s letter to Elizabeth reads more like a complaint about misrepresentation than a plea for privacy. Essex is anxious not because the balladeers and playwrights are writing about him, but that they are writing what they “list” about him. A few years later, Cleopatra, that most histrionic of Shakespeare’s queens, recoiling at the prospect of Roman submission, offered a strikingly similar objection to that composed by Essex:

Saucy lictors
Will catch at us like strumpets, and scald rhymers
Ballad us out o’tune. The quick comedians
Extemporally will stage us, and present
Our Alexandrian revels; Antony
Shall be brought drunken forth, and I shall see
Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness
I’t’h’ posture of a whore.
(*Antony and Cleopatra* 5.2.214-21)

Having skillfully stage-managed her burnished image during her reign, the conquered Cleopatra knows that, along with her sovereignty, she has surrendered the rights to her posterity. If the victors write history, their players broadcast it. Acutely aware that she is about to endure a mimetic battering in ill-conceived, partial, and poorly cast reproductions of herself, Cleopatra opts for suicide, the ultimate act of Stoic self-expression and tragic self-authorship. Equally desperate to retain, or to regain, control of

⁸ Richard McCoy quotes Sir Rowland White’s letter to Sir Robert Sidney, written in early 1600, in “A Dangerous Image: The Earl of Essex and Elizabethan Chivalry,” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 13 (1983), 324.

his self-image and to salvage his character, if not his doomed career, Essex urgently deployed the same publicity outlets that his letter decries: the vile and base creatures that gnawed upon him were also the inner demons that demanded outward perfection and public adulation.

Written at the nadir of his short life, Essex's querulous note to Elizabeth, perhaps the only instance in which he speaks of himself directly rather than metaphorically in relation to the stage, offers a telling reflection on his equivocal connection to the history players. Of particular significance to this thesis, Essex tacitly acknowledges the existence of the history players, the authors/actors who transform political figures into historical analogies, into "what forms they list." That Essex denounces their activities to his Queen, whose homology with Richard II had been promoted especially by his factional writers Daniel and Shakespeare, must have struck Elizabeth as both ironic and hypocritical. Essex's recognition that the many-headed monster of the popular media could not be controlled and would soon turn against him perhaps also speaks to his inherent distrust of the theater as a stable medium for self-promotion. As I have repeatedly noted in the preceding chapters of this thesis, Essex, perhaps more than any other politician of the period, made himself available to advice, to education, and to a level of critique whose contained strictures ultimately augmented his public image as a scholar and a statesman.⁹ Yet Shakespeare, the principal playwright to promote the Essex persona in the late 1590s, proved a particularly tough judge of political character. While Shakespeare never did

⁹ In "The Earl of Essex, Fulke Greville, and the Employment of Scholars," *Studies in Philology* 91.2 (1994), Hammer notes that Essex's third and final letter of advice to the young Earl of Rutland, which encourages the employment of ambitious, opinionated young scholars from the universities, was polished up and publicly disseminated in October 1600, yet another gambit in his "quest for rehabilitation" 170.

Essex the disservice of caricaturing him, neither was he a flatterer, and we can only imagine how the Earl and his supporters processed the refiguring of the *gestalt* statesman of Essex and Bacon's *Of Love and Self-Love* into the potentially schizophrenic personae of *I Henry IV*. While Essex might not have censured such theatrical critiques in the public arena, there is no evidence that he personally condoned them. Indeed, if Essex's speculation that he will "shortly" be played upon the stage refers obliquely to ambitions among his inner circle to finance productions in support of specific factional requirements or events, then his disapproving tone supports my hypothesis that the *Richard II* commission was organized at the behest of his factional confederates rather than by himself. Either way, my sense is that the role of factional impresario was delegated to close associates better qualified and more inclined to the medium -- Southampton perhaps working with the public playwrights and Fulke Greville with the closet dramatists -- and that the authors were kept at one remove from the core of the faction.

Essex had good reason to fear the judgment of theatrical posterity. The evolution of the Protestant warrior into a prostrate lover in the post-execution ballads would have astonished, even appalled Essex, who wished to be remembered, above all, as a soldier and a statesman. Although his politically motivated reconciliations with Elizabeth in Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* and Robert Prickett's poem *Honor's fame in triumph riding* were designed as radically nostalgic challenges to the new Jacobean administration, Essex's posthumous stage career on both sides of the Channel clearly fed upon his softer image in the popular imagination. Romanticized versions of Essex soon appeared in French melodramas, notably La Calprenède's *Le Comte d'Essex* (1639) and Thomas

Corneille's 1678 play of the same name, with the latter still being performed in the early nineteenth century.¹⁰ Despite being set amid the factional turmoil of the late-Elizabethan court, both plays are inherently sentimental. In La Calprenède's plot, for instance, Essex's former lover, a rather improbable Lady Cecil, wife of his archrival, betrays him when she refuses to return to Elizabeth the ring that would save his life. "The emotional power" that generates the factional infighting in the play, writes Guy Snaith, "is that of Essex over Elizabeth and Lady Cecil and is synonymous with the power of love."¹¹ The enduring success of Corneille's play spawned two Restoration adaptations in London, *The secret history of the most renown'd Q. Elizabeth and the E. of Essex* (1680) by an anonymous "person of quality," and John Banks's *The Unhappy Favourite* (1682), both of which employ the ring legend as a key plot device. Banks's play formed the basis for Maxwell Anderson's *Elizabeth the Queen* (1930), which, nine years later, was adapted into the Hollywood screenplay, *The Private Lives of Elizabeth and Essex*. The legacy of three centuries of theatrical re-presentations has helped shape our present conceptions of Essex.

How much, if at all, the factional playwrights in this study directly influenced Essex's theatrical resurgence during the Restoration lies beyond the scope of this study. Yet the contrast between Daniel and Chapman's inherently radical Neostoic plays and the

¹⁰ In fact, the first play to feature Essex on stage was Antonio Coello's *Dar la Vida por su Dama* (1633, pub. 1638), which featured the tantalizingly named El Conde de Sex, whose execution is staged as a crime of passion enacted by a jealous and bigoted Queen Elizabeth; for details, see Winifred Smith, "The Earl of Essex on Stage," *PMLA* 39.1 (1924), 147-50.

¹¹ Guy Snaith, "The Portrayal of Power in La Calprenède's *Le Comte D'Essex*," *Modern Language Review* 81.4 (1986), 855.

essentially reactionary Anglo-French melodramas that came later,¹² suggests that, while Essex's anxiety over the stage was prescient, he underestimated the dedication and the determination of his faction's playwrights. If these authors were not flatterers, they were not turncoats either. While, in *Philotas* and *Byron*, Daniel and Chapman's appropriations of Essex in pursuit of their anti-absolutist agendas placed him at odds with a king whose nomination he had once endorsed, the playwrights doubtless believed that they were upholding the "radical moderatism" at the heart of the faction's philosophies. Indeed, the sharp decline of the post-Essexians under James and their rapid migration to the counter court developing around Prince Henry suggest that, had Essex survived Elizabeth, he would have come into conflict with James soon enough. That the Jacobean writers, rather than building memorials to Essex or protecting his legacy, exploited his *energeia* in the pursuit of live causes is surely testimony to his enduring dissidence, to his politic utility.

Of the four authors in this study, only Hayward -- last in, least invested, and first out -- fully disengaged himself from the Essex circle. Although Daniel abandoned Essex after 1605 and Chapman perhaps substituted him for his son in 1608, their apostasies were never absolute; closure was contingent and tinged with a tangible sense of loss and mourning. Daniel knew that, by burying Essex in a literary tomb "so that he might never be remembered among the examples of disloyalty," his Apology to *Philotas* would effectively immortalize Essex's crime, or at least Daniel's judgment of it: so the Apology remained unpublished for eighteen years.¹³ Rather than leaving the Lord Chancellor or

¹² I speculate, for instance, that Essex's refiguration as a royal lover might have been part of a Restoration agenda to eclipse his son's Parliamentary career.

¹³ *The 'Tragedy of Philotas' by Samuel Daniel*, ed. Laurence Michel (New Haven: Yale UP, 1949), 156.

King Henry to pontificate on Byron's treasonous crimes from the scaffold, Chapman allows his fallen hero the last word and a Stoic death that his previous machinations hardly warranted: "Strike, strike, O strike! Fly, fly, commanding soul, / And on thy wings for this thy body's breath, / Bear the eternal victory of death" (*Tr.* 5.4.260-62). Both writers were reluctant to renounce Essex publicly.

Even the dissenting Shakespeare, like the impotent social commentator Thersites in *Troilus and Cressida*, struggled to fully repudiate the Achilleian Essex. While Thersites "treats the war as a spectator sport" and mocks the nationalist sentiments of both sides,¹⁴ he defends his general against Ajax, who "grumblest and railest every hour on Achilles" because he is "full of envy at his greatness" (*T&C* 2.1.32-34) and acknowledges his perverse allegiance to his faction's leader: "Agamemnon is a fool to offer to command Achilles; Achilles is a fool to be commanded of Agamemnon; Thersites is a fool to serve such a fool" (*T&C* 2.3.56-58).¹⁵ In subsequent tragedies -- *Othello*, *Macbeth*, *Timon of Athens*, *Antony and Cleopatra* -- Shakespeare repeatedly dismantles the epic conception of heroism, and each of his later soldier-heroes, notes George C. Ide, ultimately "empties himself of heroic pretensions and conceives himself anew in the tragic forge."¹⁶ Shakespeare's exorcizing of the Achilleian spirit verges on the obsessive. Yet even in *Coriolanus*, his last and most politically implicated tragedy, Shakespeare cannot suppress the sense of pathetic waste and terrible loss in the slaughter

¹⁴ Matthew A. Greenfield, "Fragments of Nationalism in *Troilus and Cressida*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51.2 (2000), 189.

¹⁵ It is worth noting that Thersites is a "voluntary," or volunteer, in the army (*T&C* 2.1.92).

¹⁶ Richard S. Ide, *Possessed with Greatness* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1980), 18.

of Caius Martius, who is destroyed as much by his philosophic virtue as by his hubris. Moreover, by redeploying the “vayling” trope that had once characterized Essex’s populist policies, Shakespeare perhaps reminds his new Blackfriars’ audience of what they had lost with Essex’s death. By failing to fulfill Volumnia’s advice that he talk to the Roman citizens “with [his] bonnet in his hand” and his “knee bussing the stones” (*Cor.* 3.2.73-75), Coriolanus signs his death warrant; by actively interceding with London’s citizens -- figuratively through the factional literature and physically during the 1601 uprising -- Essex signed his. In the early years of James’ reign, as the tensions intensified between the King’s prerogative claims and parliament’s, Essex’s populism must increasingly have seemed less like an Achilles’ heel than an assertion of an ancient right.

In their Jacobean tragedies, the factional playwrights share ideological concerns central to the Neostoics and the post-Essexians: the need to find an alternative political philosophy and a viable political figure -- “royal man,” Chapman called him -- to check the growing power of absolutist monarchy. And their failure to locate such a leader or such a philosophic resolution produced similarly Stoic responses: Daniel sought dignified semi-retirement in the country; Shakespeare retreated into a world of Romance and reconciliation; and Chapman replaced the Achilleian Bussy and Byron with his Senecal men -- Chabot, Claremont, Cato -- figures of fortitude and self-sufficiency who would rather die than fight for their beliefs. In the new political reality, the aristocratic warrior was a nostalgic anachronism, his status diminished to that of a political pawn in the emerging conflict for the commonwealth between King and parliament. The staging of the *vox populi*, if such a thing were possible or desirable, must be left to another generation of playwrights.

If, at some level, all the writers in this study had vested interests in approaching the Essex faction -- a job in Hayward's case and a favorable cultural climate in Shakespeare's; a new patron for Chapman and an additional one for Daniel -- they found common philosophical ground under the extensive Essex standard. Described by Blair Worden as a "rebel without a theory," Essex and his faction certainly lacked a coherent ideology.¹⁷ But then, Essex was more of a politician than an ideologue, and he espoused toleration rather than dogma: for dissenting Protestants and loyal Catholics; for new scientists and old philosophers; for feudal values and secular realism; for martial innovation and cultural freedom; above all, for shared government in the face of encroaching absolutism. If anything, Essex was a rebel with too many causes. He "seems to have imagined himself uniting all the varied and contradictory currents of ideological and practical hostility to the government into a single movement, bound by his own charisma" writes Margot Heinemann, "and this proved a gross overestimation and self-delusion."¹⁸ Yet the quality of writers, philosophers, and artists attracted to the faction characterizes Essex as so much more than an aggressive egomaniac, a political opportunist, or a cultural dilettante. The four authors in this study, all ambitious young men from the country, were already highly considered in their fields, and they had as much to lose in supporting Essex as they hoped to gain. More or less independent, intellectually ambitious, ideologically liberal, they elected to promote, if not Essex

¹⁷ Margot Heinemann cites Worden's comment in an unpublished paper on Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* in "Rebel Lords, Popular Playwrights, and Political Culture: Notes on the Jacobean Patronage of the Earl of Southampton," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991), 64.

¹⁸ Heinemann 65.

himself, then his extraordinary public persona -- his “megalopsychē” -- to an audience of increasingly alienated citizens and vigilant censors. The enduring relationship between Essex and the playwrights in particular enriches our sense of the cultural allure and sophistication of his circle, and of the status and function of its writers.

The ultimate aim of this thesis, as I stated in the Introduction, is to ascertain whether Hayward, Shakespeare, Daniel, and Chapman can be considered factional writers (that is, authors who, rather than being employed by the Essex faction, wrote intermittently for it, or on its behalf). While I have argued that each of these authors was more or less ideologically committed to Essex’s “radical moderatism” and cultural inclusivity, the label “factional writer” presupposes a level of demonstrable intentionality: rather than having his work commandeered by pressure groups, the factional writer contributes to a literary methodology and a political agenda. I have attempted to prove this contentious position by exploring intertextuality among authors who were accused of Essexian affiliations. I have considered, in particular, how their uses of politic history played a key role in the evolution of an anglicized Tacitean historiography; and how their evasive tropes -- Hayward’s productive anachronisms, Shakespeare’s refractive mirrors, Daniel’s eloquent silences, and Hayward’s rotating triforms -- contributed to the cultural coding of the “hermeneutics of censorship.”

I have also attempted to correlate the authors’ biographical, cultural, rhetorical, and political moves: to make my analyses interactive and to generate what Anne Barton calls a “dialogue among plays.”¹⁹ In writing this thesis, I have wrestled, much like the

¹⁹ See Barton’s review of Howard Felperin, *Shakespearean Representation*, 135-37, quoted in Ide xv.

early modern historiographer, with opposing dialectical pressures: with the need to create a deterministic, almost providential, superstructure of chronological chapters marching progressively toward a conclusion and a recognition, similar to that of the politic historian, that history is cyclical, and that its lessons emerge from its repeating patterns. While individual chapters isolate biographical, rhetorical, and ideological trends unique to an author, their chronologies and thematic concerns repeatedly overlap and turn back upon one another. Such disruptions, rather than complicating the thesis, help to validate it: evidence of factional involvement, such as it is, emerges in the way authors intrude upon each other's chapters, involve themselves in each other's works. My conception of the intertextual operations of the Essex circle is only partial and will benefit from further study. Analysis of the dramatic works of authors suspected of factional activity who were yet indifferent or antagonistic to Essex, such as Ben Jonson and the satirist Everard Guilpin, would help to define the circle from without. A survey of authors untroubled by the censor who seemed to offer occasional or nominal support, such as Thomas Heywood, would help measure the scope of its diameter.²⁰ I hope, nonetheless, that in this thesis I have begun to reveal the presence in early modern London of the factional writer who collaborated from a distance with political patrons and fellow authors, writing alone but with the window open. Locating a place for these authors within the Essex circle, I ultimately seek to contribute to Paul Hammer's conception of a sophisticated,

²⁰ Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West, or a girl worth gold*, c.1597-1603, opens with two sea captains preparing to set sail for the Azores with their "noble Generall," whose "great success at Cales [...] hath put heart into the English" (1.1.8-10); Regents Renaissance Drama Series, ed. Robert K. Turner (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1967).

humanist, and self-interrogating bureaucracy, to bring a degree of humanity and personality to the Essex faction, and a level of political authority to its history players.

Bibliography

- Abbott, Edwin A. *Francis Bacon: An Account of His Life and Works*. London: Macmillan, 1885.
- Acheson, Arthur. *Shakespeare, Chapman, and 'Sir Thomas More'*. New York: Edmund Byrne Hackett, 1931.
- Adams, Joseph Quincy. "Eastward Hoe and its Satire against the Scots." *Studies in Philology* 28, no. 4 (Oct., 1931): 689-701.
- Adams, Robert P. "Despotism, Censorship, and Mirrors of Power Politics in Late Elizabethan Times." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 10, no. 3 (1979): 5-16.
- Adams, Simon. "Faction, Clientage, and Party: English Politics between, 1530-1603." *History Today* 32 (1982): 33-39.
- Adamson, J.H., and H.F. Folland. *The Shepherd of the Ocean: An Account of Sir Walter Raleigh and His Times*. Boston: Gambit, 1969.
- Adkins, Mary Grace Muse. "A Theory About the *Life and Death of Jack Straw*." *The University of Texas Studies in English* 28 (1949): 57-82.
- Akrigg, G.P.V. *Shakespeare and the Earl of Southampton*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Albright, Evelyn May. "Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Essex Conspiracy." *PMLA* 42, no. 3 (1927): 686-720.
- . "The Folio Version of *Henry V* in Relation to Shakespeare's Times." *PMLA* 43, no. 3 (1928): 722-56.

- . "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, Hayward's *History of Henry IV*, and the Essex Conspiracy." *PMLA* 46, no. 3 (1931): 694-719.
- Anon. *Thomas of Woodstock, or, Richard II, Part One*. Edited by P.C.D.Sedge. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- . *The Life and Death of Jack Straw*. Edited by F.P. Wilson, Malone Society Reprints. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1595.
- . *A True and Perfect Discourse of the Practices and Treasons of Marshall Biron, Together with the Particulars of His Arraignment and Execution: Faithfully Translated out of the French*. London, 1602.
- . *Robert Earle of Essex His Ghost: Sent from Elizian. Printed in Paradise*. London, 1624.
- . *A Post-Script, or, a Second Part of Robert Earle of Essex His Ghost*. Printed in Paradise. London, 1624.
- . *The British Drama: Tragedies, Comedies, Operas and Farces in the English Language*. Edited by William Miller. London 1804.
- Ascham, Roger. *The Scholemaster*. Edited by E. Arber. London: London English Reprints, 1927.
- Atkinson, James B., and David Sices, eds. *The Sweetness of Power: Machiavelli's 'Discourses' and Guicciardini's 'Considerations'*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2002.
- Axton, Marie. *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession*. London: London Historical Society, 1977.

- Bacon, Francis. *A Declaration of the Practices and Treasons Attempted and Committed by the Late Robert Earle of Essex and His Complices, against Her Majesty and Her Kingdoms*. London, 1601.
- . *Sylva Sylvarum; or a Naturall Historie*. London, 1626.
- . *Works*. Edited by James Spedding, Robert Ellis and Douglas Heath. 15 vols. Boston, 1857-74.
- Banks, John. *The Unhappy Favorite, or, the Earl of Essex*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.
- Barber, C.L. *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.
- Barish, Jonas A., ed. *Sejanus*. New Haven: Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Barroll, Leeds. "A New History for Shakespeare and His Time." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (1988): 441-64.
- . "Shakespeare and Roman History." *The Modern Language Review* 53, no. 3 (Jul., 1958): 327-43.
- Bartlett, Phyllis Brooks, ed. *The Poems of George Chapman*. New York: MLA, 1941.
- Barton, Anne. *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1962.
- Bate, Jonathan. *Soul of the Age: A Biography of the Mind of William Shakespeare*. New York: Random House, 2009.
- Battenhouse, Roy. "Chapman's 'The Shadow of Night': An Interpretation." *Studies in Philology* 38, no. 4 (Oct., 1941): 584-608.
- Bednarz, James P. *Shakespeare and the Poet's War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

- Bell, Doyne C. *Notices of the Historic Persons Buried in the Chapel of St Peter Ad Vincula in the Tower of London*. London: John Murray, 1877.
- Bement, Peter. "The Imagery of Darkness and Light in Chapman's *Bussy D'ambois*." *Studies in Philology* 64, no. 2 (Apr., 1967): 187-98.
- Benario, Herbert W. "Shakespeare's Debt to Tacitus' *Histories*." *Notes and Queries* 55, no. 2 (2008): 202-5.
- Benjamin, Edwin B. "Sir John Hayward and Tacitus." *The Review of English Studies* 8, no. 31 (1957): 275-76.
- Bennett, Robert B. "Four Stages of Time: The Shape of History in Shakespeare's Second Tetralogy." *Shakespeare Studies* 19 (1987): 61-85.
- Bergeron, David M. "Shakespeare Makes History: 2 *Henry IV*." *Studies in English Literature* 31, no. 2 (1991): 231-45.
- Black, J.B. *The Reign of Elizabeth: 1558-1603*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.
- Bloom, Harold. *'Hamlet': Poem Unlimited*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2003.
- Boas, F.S. "Edward Grimeston, Translator and Sergeant-at-Arms." *Modern Philology* 3, no. 4 (Apr., 1906): 395-409.
- Bodin, Jean. *The Six Bookes of a Common-Weale. Written by J. Bodin a Famous Lawyer, and a Man of Great Experience in Matters of State. Out of the French and Latine Copies, Done into English, by Richard Knolles*. London, 1606.
- . *A Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*. New York: Norton, 1969.
- Boileau, Sieur de. *The Art of Poetry*. Translated by William Soame. London, 1683.
- Booth, Stephen. *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.
- Boswell-Stone, W.G., ed. *Shakespeare's Holinshed*. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1896.

- Bradbrook, M.C. *George Chapman*. Reading: Longman, 1936.
- . *The School of Night*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.
- . *George Chapman, Writers & Their Work*. Reading: Longmans, 1977.
- Braden, Gordon. *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition*. Newhaven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Bradford, Alan T. "Stuart Absolutism and the Utility of Tacitus." *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 46, no. 2 (1983): 127-55.
- Braunmuller, A. R. "Chapman's Use of Plutarch's *De Fortuna Romanum* in the *Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron*." *Review of English Studies* 23 (1972): 178-79.
- . "Shakespeare and Chapman." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (1982): 538-40.
- . "*King John* and Historiography." *English Literary History* 55, no. 2 (1988): 309-32.
- . *Natural Fictions: George Chapman's Major Tragedies*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992.
- Briggs, John Channing. "Chapman's *Seaven Bookes of the Iliades*: Mirror for Essex." *Studies in English Literature* 21, no. 1 (1981): 59-73.
- Brooke, N.S., ed. *Bussy D'Ambois*. Manchester University Press: The Revels Plays, 1964.
- Broud, Ronald. "George Chapman's Stoic-Christian Revenger." *Studies in Philology* 70, no. 1 (1973): 51-61.
- Brown, Piers. "'Hac Ex Consilio Meo Via Progredieris': Courtly Reading and Secretarial Meditation in Donne's 'the Courtier Library.'" *Renaissance Quarterly* 61 (Fall, 2008): 833-66.

- Buchtel, John A. "Book Dedications and the Death of a Patron." *Book History*: Penn State University Press 7 (2004): 1-29.
- Buisseret, David. *Henry IV: King of France*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1990.
- Burke, P. "Tacitism." In *Tacitus*, edited by T.A. Dorey. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Cadman, Daniel. "'Th'accession of These Mighty States': Daniel's *Philotas* and the Union of Crowns." *Renaissance Studies Online* (Mar. 2011).
- Camden, William. *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- . *Annales Rerum Gestarum Angliae Et Hiberniae Regnante Elizabetha* (1615 and 1625)." ed Dana F. Sutton. London, 1625.
- Campbell, Lily B. *Shakespeare's Histories: Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy*. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1947.
- Campbell, Lily B, ed. *The Mirror for Magistrates*. New York: Barnes Noble Inc, 2008.
- . "The Use of Historical Patterns in the Reign of Elizabeth." *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 2 (Jan 1938): 135-67.
- Cannon, Charles Kendrick. "Chapman on the Unity of Style and Meaning." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 68, no. 2 (Apr., 1969): 245-64.
- Canny, Nicholas. *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Cartelli, Thomas. *Marlowe, Shakespeare, and the Economy of Theatrical Experience*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.

Cavanaugh, Louis Crompton and Hilayne. "Shaw's Lecture on *Troilus and Cressida*."

The Shaw Review 14, no. 2 (May, 1971): 48-67.

Chambers, E.K. *The Elizabethan Stage*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.

———. *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*. 2 vols. Oxford:

Clarendon Press, 1930.

———. "Court Performances under James the First." *The Modern Language Review* 4, no. 2 (Jan., 1909): 153-66.

Chapman, George. *The Conspiracie, and Tragoedie of Charles Duke of Byron, Marshall of France Acted Lately in Two Playes, at the Black-Friers, and Other Publique Stages. Written by George Chapman*. (1625), EEBO Editions. Breinigsville: Proquest, 2011.

Chettle, Henry. *Englande's Mourning Garment: Worne Here by Plaine Shepheardes; in Memories of Their Sacred Mistresse*. London 1603.

Chillington, Carol A. "Playwrights at Work: Henslowe's Not Shakespeare's, *Book of Sir Thomas More*." *English Literary Renaissance* 10 (1980): 439-79.

Churchyard, Thomas. *Churchyard's Challenge*. London, 1593.

Clare, Janet. "'Greater Themes for Insurrection's Arguing': Political Censorship of the Elizabethan and Jacobean Stage." *The Review of English Studies* 38, no. 150 (1987): 169-83.

———. "The Censorship of the Deposition Scene in *Richard II*." *The Review of English Studies* 41, no. 161 (1990): 89-94.

———. *'Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority': Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990.

- Clark, Andrew, ed. *John Aubrey, Brief Lives, 1669-1696*. 2 vols. Oxford :Clarendon Press, 1898.
- Clark, Ira. "Samuel Daniel's *Complaint of Rosamond*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (Summer 1970): 152-62.
- Clegg, Cyndia Susan. "'by the Choise and Invitation of Al the Realme': *Richard II* and Elizabethan Press Censorship." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48, no. 4 (1997): 432-48.
- . *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Coddon, Karin S. "'Such Stange Desyngs': Madness, Subjectivity, and Treason in *Hamlet* and Elizabethan Culture." *Renaissance Drama* 20 (1989): 57-75.
- Cole, Douglas. "Myth and Anti-Myth: The Case of *Troilus and Cressida*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31, no. 1 (Spring, 1980): 76-84.
- Collinson, Patrick. *Elizabethan Essays*. London: Hambledon Press, 1994.
- . "Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism." In *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, edited by John Guy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Conklin, Willet Titus. "Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*, and Essex." *The University of Texas Bulletin: Studies in English* 11, no. 3133 (1931): 42-47.
- Cornwallis, William. *A Discourse of the Most Illustrious Prince, Henry, Late Prince of Wales*. London, 1626.
- . *Essayes*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1946.

- Cotton, Robert. *An Answer Made by Command of Prince Henry, to Certain Propositions of Warre and Peace, Delivered to His Highness by Some of His Military Servants*. London, 1655.
- Craig, Hardin, ed. *Essays in Dramatic Literature: The Parrott Presentation Volume*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1935.
- Craig, Jane Melbourne. "Chapman's Two *Byrons*." *Studies in English Literature* 22, no. 2 (Spring, 1982): 271-83.
- Croft, Pauline. "The Reputation of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* sixth series, no. 1 (1991): 43-69.
- Culler, Jonathan. "Presupposition and Intertextuality." *MLN* 91, no. 6 (1976): 1380-96.
- Curran, John E. "'Duke Byron Flows with Adust and Melancholy Choler': General and Special Character in Chapman's *Byron* Plays." *Studies in Philology* 108, no. 3 (Summer 2011): 245-78.
- Dean, Paul. "Tudor Humanism and the Roman Past: A Background to Shakespeare." *Renaissance Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (Spring, 1988): 84-111.
- Devereux, Walter Bouchier, ed. *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1853.
- Devereux, Robert, 2nd Earl of Essex. *An Apologie of the Earle of Essex*. London, c.1598.
- Donaldson, Ian, ed. *Ben Jonson*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Donne, John. *The Poetical Works of Dr. John Donne: Containing His Satires, Songs and Sonnets, Epigrams, Elegies, Epithalamions, Letters, Funeral Elegies, Holy*

- Sonnets, &C. &C. &C. To Which Is Prefixed the Life of the Author.*
Edinburgh, 1793.
- Dowling, Margaret. "Sir John Hayward's Troubles over His *Life of Henry IV.*" *The Library* 4, no. 11 (1930-31): 212-14.
- Drukakis, John, ed. *Alternative Shakespeares*. London: Routledge, 1985.
- Dutton, Richard. *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1991.
- . "Buggeswords: Samuel Harsnett and the Licensing, Suppression and Afterlife of Dr. John Hayward's the *First Part of the Life and Reign of King Henry IV.*" *Criticism* 35, no. 3 (1993): 305-39.
- Eccles, Mark. "Chapman's Early Years." *Studies in Philology* 43, no. 2 (1946): 176-93.
- . "Samuel Daniel in France and Italy." *Studies in Philology* 34, no. 2 (Apr., 1937): 148-67.
- Eliot, T.S. *Selected Essays*. London: Faber and Faber, 1932.
- Ellis, Havelock. *Chapman*. London: Nonesuch Press, 1934.
- Elyot, Thomas. *The Book Named the Governor*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1969.
- Evans, Robert Harding. *Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative*. 4 vols. London: Bulmer and Company, 1810.
- Evans, Richard J. *In Defense of History*. New York: Norton, 2004.
- Farrad, Grant. "Achilles, Celebrity Recluse." *PMLA* 126, no. 4 (2011): 1102-9.
- Fellowes, E. H., ed. *English Madrigal Verse: 1588-1632*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1820.

- Ferguson, Arthur B. *The Articulate Citizen and the English Renaissance*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1965.
- . "The Historical Thought of Samuel Daniel: A Study in Renaissance Ambivalence." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32, no. 2 (1971): 185-202.
- Ferguson, A.S. "The Plays of George Chapman." *The Modern Language Review* 13, no. 1 (Jan., 1918): 1-24.
- . "The Plays of George Chapman. II." *The Modern Language Review* 15, no. 3 (July, 1920): 223-39.
- Fish, Charles. "*Henry IV*: Shakespeare and Holinshed." *Studies in Philology* 61, no. 2 (1964): 205-18.
- Fitter, Chris. "Historicizing *Richard II*: Current Events, Dating, and the Sabotage of Essex." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 11, no. 2 (2005): 1-47.
- Florby, Gunilla. *The Painful Passage to Virtue: A Study of George Chapman's the 'Tragedy of Bussy D'Ambois' and the 'Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois'*. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1982.
- . *Echoing Texts: George Chapman's 'Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron'*. Gothenburg: Lund University, 2004.
- Foakes, R. A. *Henslowe's Diary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Forsythe, Robert S. "Tacitus, *Henry VI, Part III*, and Nero." *Modern Language Notes* 42, no. 1 (1927): 25-27.
- Friedman, Alan Warren. "Hamlet the Unready." *Modern Language Quarterly* 37, no. 1 (1976): 15-34.

- Furnivall, Frederick James, and William Richard Morfill. *Ballads from Manuscripts*. 4 vols. London: Ballad Society, 1873.
- Fussner, F. Smith. *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.
- Gabel, John B. "The Original Version of Chapman's *Tragedy of Byron*." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 63, no. 3 (July, 1964): 433-40.
- Gadja, Alexandra. "The State of Christendom: History, Political Thought and the Essex Circle." *Historical Research* 81, no. 213 (2008): 423-46.
- Gazzard, Hugh. "'Those Grave Presentiments of Antiquitie': Samuel Daniel's *Philotas* and the Earl of Essex." *Review of English Studies* 51, no. 203 (2000): 423-50.
- Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Gill, R.B. "Moral History and Daniel's *Civil Wars*." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 76, no. 3 (1977): 334-45.
- Gittings, Robert. *Shakespeare's Rival*. London: Heinemann, 1960.
- Godshalk, William Leigh. "Daniel's History." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 63, no. 1 (1964): 45-57.
- Goldberg, S. L. "Sir John Hayward, 'Politic' Historian." *The Review of English Studies* 6, no. 23 (1955): 233-44.
- Gosson, Stephen. *Playes Confuted in Five Actions*. New York: Garland, 1982.
- Gottfried, Rudolf B. "Samuel Daniel's Method of Writing History." *Studies in the Renaissance* 3 (1956): 157-74.

- Gouws, John, ed. *The Prose Works of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke*. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Green, Mary Ann Everett. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1595-97*. London: Longman, 1869.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- . *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*. Norman, Oklahoma: Pilgrim Books, 1982.
- . *Shakespearean Negotiations*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus, eds. *The Norton Shakespeare*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1997.
- Greenfield, Matthew A. "Fragments of Nationalism in *Troilus and Cressida*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (Summer, 2000): 181-200.
- Greenlaw, Edwin. *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1932.
- Greg, W.W. *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama: A Literary Inquiry with Special Reference to the Pre-Restoration*. New York: Russell and Russell, (1906) 1959.
- . "Samuel Harsnett and Hayward's *Henry IV*." *The Library* 5, no. 9 (Mar. 1956): 1-10.
- Greville, Fulke. *Life of Sir Philip Sidney*. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1907.
- Griffin, Benjamin. *Playing the Past: Approaches to English Historical Drama, 1383-1600*. Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2001.

- Grimeston, Edward. *A Generall Historie of France, Written by John De Serres Unto the Year 1598; Contynued by Peter Mathew to the Death of King Henry the Fourth in the Yeare*. London, 1624.
- Grosart, A.B., ed. *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Samuel Daniel*. 5 vols. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.
- , ed. *Miscellanies*. 4 vols. The New Shakespeare Society Publications. Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Limited, 1965.
- Grossman, John, ed. *The Chicago Manual of Style*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Gross, John. *After Shakespeare: An Anthology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Guilpin, Everard. *Skialetheia, or a Shadow of Truth*. In *Certaine Epigrams and Satyres*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.
- Gunn, Steven. "The Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6, no. 5 (1995): 59-90.
- Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . "Hamlet and the Auto Da Fe." *Around the Globe* 1314-15 (2000).
- Guy, John. *The Rhetoric of Counsel in Early Modern England*. Edited by Dale Hoak. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Hammer, Paul. "The Earl of Essex, Fulke Greville, and the Employment of Scholars." *Studies in Philology* 91, no. 2 (1994): 167-80.
- . "The Uses of Scholarship: The Secretariat of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex, c. 1585-1601." *The English Historical Review* 109, no. 430 (1994): 26-51.

- . "Essex and Europe: Evidence from Confidential Instructions by the Earl of Essex." *The English Historical Review* 111, no. 441 (1996): 357-81.
- . "Myth-Making: Politics, Propaganda and the Capture of Cadiz in 1596." *The Historical Journal* 40, no. 3 (1997): 621-42.
- . "Upstaging the Queen: The Earl of Essex, Francis Bacon and the Accession Day Celebrations of 1595." In *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, edited by David Bevington and Peter Holbrook. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . *The Polarization of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-97*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- . "Sex and the Virgin Queen: Aristocratic Concupiscence and the Court of the Virgin Queen." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 31, no. 1 (2000): 77-97.
- . "'the Smiling Crocodile': The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan 'Popularity'." In *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, edited by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- . "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February, 1601, and the Essex Rising." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 60, no. 2 (2009): 1-35.
- Hampton, Timothy. *Writing from History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Harrison, G.B. *The Life and Death of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex*. London: Cassell and Company, 1937.
- Hattway, Michael, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

- Hayward, John. *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII*. London, 1599.
- . *The Lives of the III. Normans, Kings of England William the First. William the Second. Henrie the First*. London, 1613.
- Heffner, Ray. "Shakespeare, Hayward, and Essex." *PMLA* 45, no. 3 (1930): 754-80.
- . "Essex the Ideal Courtier." *English Literary History* 1, no. 1 (1934): 67-82.
- . "Essex and Book V of the *Fairie Queene*." *English Literary History* 3, no. 1 (1936): 67-82.
- Heinemann, Margot. "Rebel Lords, Popular Playwrights, and Political Culture: Notes on the Jacobean Patronage of the Earl of Southampton." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (Nov. 1991): 63-86.
- Henry Wotton, Sir. *A Parallel Betweene Robert Late Earle of Essex, and George Late Duke of Buckingham*. London 1641.
- Heywood, Thomas. *An Apology for Actors Containing Three Briefe Treatises. 1 Their Antiquity. 2 Their Ancient Dignity. 3 the True Use of Their Quality*. London, 1612.
- . *King Edward IV, Parts I and II*. London: Shakespeare Society, 1842.
- . *The Fair Maid of the West, Parts I and II*. Edited by Robert K. Turner, Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.
- Higgins, Michael. "The Development of the 'Senecal Man'. Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* and Some Precursors." *The Review of English Studies* 23, no. 89 (Jan., 1947): 24-33.
- . "Chapman's 'Senecal Man'. A Study in Jacobean Psychology." *The Review of English Studies* 21, no. 83 (Jul., 1945): 183-91.

- Hiller, Geoffrey G., and Peter L. Groves, eds. *Samuel Daniel: Selected Poetry and a Defense of Rhyme*. Asheville, NC: Pegasus Press, 1998.
- Hinman, Charlton, ed. *The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1996.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2003.
- Hodgdon, Barbara. *The End Crowns All*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- . *Shakespeare in Performance: 'Henry IV, Part Two'*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *The Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. 3 vols. London, 1587.
- Holloway, Carson. "Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* and Aristotle's Great-Souled Man." *The Review of Politics* 69, no. 3 (Summer, 2007): 353-74.
- Homan, Sidney R. "Chapman and Marlowe: The Paradoxical Hero and the Divided Response." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 68, no. 3 (Jul., 1969): 391-406.
- Honan, Park. *Shakespeare: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Honigman, E.A.J. "Shakespeare's Plutarch." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (1959): 25-33.
- Hosley, Richard, ed. *Shakespeare's Holinshed*. New York: Capricorn Books, 1968.
- Houliston, Victor. *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Person's Jesuit Polemic, 1580-1610*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1980.
- . "The Hare and the Drum: Robert Person's Writings on the English Succession, 1593-96." *Renaissance Studies* 14, no. 2 (2000): 235-50.

- Howard, Jean E. *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Howard-Hill, T.H., ed. *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More': Essays on the Play and its Shakespearean Interest*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . "Political Interpretations of Middleton's *A Game at Chess* (1624)." *Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 274-85.
- Huffman, Clifford Chalmers. *John Wolfe and His Press*. New York: AMS, 1988.
- Hughes, Paul L., and James Francis Larkin. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*. 3 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.
- Hulse, S. Clark. "Samuel Daniel: The Poet and Literary Historian." *Studies in English Literature* 19, no. 1 (1979): 55-69.
- Hume, Anthea. "Love's Martyr, 'The Phoenix and the Turtle,' and the Aftermath of the Essex Rebellion." *The Review of English Studies* 40, no. 157 (1989): 48-71.
- Hunter, G.K. "*Henry IV* and the Elizabethan Two-Part Play." *The Review of English Studies* 5, no. 19 (July, 1954): 236-48.
- Huntington, Hugh M. "Shakespeare's Navarre." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (1979): 193-216.
- Ide, Richard S. *Possessed with Greatness*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- Ioppolo, Grace. *Dramatists and Their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare: Jonson, Middleton and Heywood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Irace, Kathleen O., ed. *The First Quarto of 'Hamlet'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- J.M.Robertson. *Shakespeare and Chapman: A Thesis of Chapman's Authorship of 'a Lover's Complaint', and His Originat.* London: T.F. Unwin, 1917.
- James I of England. *Basilikon Doron, or, His Majesties Instructions to His Dearest Sonne, Henry the Prince.* London, 1603.
- James, Mervyn. *Society, Politics and Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Jardine, Lisa, ed. *Desiderius Erasmus: The Education of the Christian Prince with the Panegyric for Archduke Philip of Austria.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1531) 1969.
- Jardine, Lisa, and William Sherman. "Pragmatic Readers: Knowledge Transactions and Scholarly Service in Late Elizabethan England." In *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Anthony Fletcher. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Jardine, M.D. "New Historicism for Old: New Conservatism for Old?: The Politics of Patronage in the Renaissance." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 286-304.
- Jenkins, Harold. *The Structural Problem in Shakespeare's 'Henry the Fourth'.* London: Methuen, 1956.
- Jonson, Ben. *The Workes of Ben Jonson.* London, 1616.
- Jorgensen, P.A. "Shakespeare's Coriolanus: Elizabethan Soldier." *PMLA* 70 (1949): 221-35.
- Kay, Dennis. *The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1900.

- Keen, Alan, ed. *The Annotator: The Pursuit of an Elizabethan Reader of Halle's 'Chronicle,' Involving Some Surmises About the Early Life of William Shakespeare*. London: Putnam, 1954.
- Kegan, Paul, ed. *Poems of Ben Jonson*. Newhaven: Yale University Press, 1962.
- Kelen, Sarah A. "'It Is Dangerous (Gentle Reader)': Censorship, Holinshed's *Chronicle*, and the Politics of Control." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27, no. 3 (2007): 705-20.
- Kelliher, Hilton. "Contemporary Manuscript Extracts from Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part 1*." In *English Manuscript Studies: 1100-1700*, edited by Peter Beal and Jeremy Griffiths. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- Kelly, Donald R., and David Harris Sacks, eds. *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Woodrow Wilson Center and Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Kennedy, Edward D. "James I and Chapman's *Byron Plays*." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 64, no. 4 (Oct., 1965): 677-90.
- Ker, W.P., ed. *Essays of John Dryden*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.
- Kewes, Paulina. "History and Its Uses." *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 68, no. 1/2 (2005): 1-31.
- Kinney, Arthur F. "Essex and Shakespeare Versus Hayward." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (1993): 464-66.
- Kneidel, Gregory. "Samuel Daniel and Edification." *Studies in English Literature* 44, no. 1 (Winter 2004): 59-76.
- Knights, L.C. "Shakespeare and Political Wisdom: A Note on the Personalism of *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus*." *The Sewanee Review* 61, no. 1 (Winter, 1953): 43-55.

- Knutson, Roslyn. *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company: 1594-1613*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1991.
- Koeppel, Emil. *Quellen-Studien Zu Den Dramen George Chapman's, Philip Massinger's Und John Ford's*, Von Emil Koeppel. Strasbourg: K.J. Trubner, 1897.
- Kott, Jan. *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Kuhl, Ernest P. "Shakespeare and Hayward." *Studies in Philology* 25, no. 3 (1928): 312-15.
- LaBranche, Anthony. "Poetry, History, and Oratory: The Renaissance Historical Poem." *Studies in English Literature* 9, no. 1 (Winter 1969): 1-19.
- Lacy, Robert. *Robert, Earl of Essex*. New York: Atheneum, 1971.
- Laing, David, ed. *Notes of Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden*. London: Shakespeare Society, 1842.
- Leavis, F.R. *New Bearings in Critical Poetry*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1932.
- LeComte, Edward S. "The Ending of *Hamlet* as a Farewell to Essex." *English Literary History* 17, no. 2 (1950): 87-114.
- Lee, Christopher. *1603: A Turning Point in British History*. London: Review, 2003.
- Leggatt, Alexander. "Tone and Structure in Chapman's *Byron*." *Studies in English Literature* 24, no. 2 (Spring, 1984): 307-26.
- Lemon, Rebecca. "The Faulty Verdict in 'the Crown v. John Hayward'." *Studies in English Literature* 41, no. 1 (2001): 109-32.
- . *Treason by Law*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- Leonard, Dean. "Sir Francis Bacon's Theory of Civil History-Writing." *English Literary History* 8, no. 3 (1941): 161-83.

- Levack, Brian. *The Civil Lawyers of England, 1603-1641*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- . "Law and Ideology: The Civil Law and Theories of Absolutism in Elizabethan and Jacobean England." In *The Historical Renaissance*, edited by Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier, 220-41. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1988.
- Levy, F.J. *Tudor Historical Thought*. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1967.
- . "Francis Bacon and the Style of Politics." In *Renaissance Historicism: Selections from 'English Literary Review'*, 146-67. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.
- . "Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 50, no. 1 (1987): 1-34.
- Lisak, Catherine. "'Succession' Versus 'Usurpation': Politics and Rhetoric in Shakespeare's *Richard II*," in *The Struggle for the Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, edited by Jean-Christophe Meyer, 353-70. Montpellier: Université Paul-Valéry, 2004.
- Loehlin, James. "The Politics of Rebellion in Holinshed, Shakespeare and Hayward." Unpublished. Shakespeare Association of America. Dallas, 2007.
- . *Henry IV: Parts I and II*, *The Shakespeare Handbook*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007.
- Lordi, Robert J., ed. *Bussy D'Ambois*, *Regents Renaissance Drama*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.
- Lucan, George M. "Lucan-Daniel-Shakespeare: New Light on the Relation between the *Civil Wars* and *Richard II*." *Shakespeare Studies* 9 (1976): 121-42.

- MacLure, Millar. *The Paul's Cross Sermons*. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1958.
- . *George Chapman: A Study*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.
- Maguin, Jean-Marie, and Michele Williams, eds. *French Essays on Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: "What Would France with Us?"*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1995.
- Mallin, Eric S. *Inscribing the Time: Shakespeare and the End of Elizabethan England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- . "Emulous Factions and the Collapse of the Chivalry in *Troilus and Cressida*." *Representations* 29 (Winter 1990): 145-79.
- Manning, John J., ed. *The First and Second Parts of John Hayward's 'the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII'*. Vol. 42. London: Royal Historical Society, 1991.
- . "Sir John Hayward (1564?-1627)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008.
- Marcus, Leah S. *Puzzling Shakespeare: Reading and Its Discontents*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Marcus, Leah S., Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose, eds. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Margeson, John, ed. *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Tamburlaine the Great, Part I*. In *English Renaissance Drama*, edited by David Bevington, 183-244. New York: Norton, (1588) 2002.
- . *The Jew of Malta*. New York: Mermaid, (1593) 1966.

- Marston, John. *Antonio and Mellida & Antonio's Revenge*, Malone Society Reprints. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Matthews, Steven. "T.S. Eliot's Chapman: "Metaphysical" Poetry and Beyond." *Journal of Modern Literature* 29, no. 4 (2006): 22-43.
- Mayer, Jean-Christophe, ed. *The Struggle for the Succession in Late Elizabethan England: Politics, Polemics and Cultural Representations*. Montpellier: Université Paul-Valéry, 2004.
- , ed. *Representing France and the French in Early Modern English Drama*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008.
- McClure, Norman Egbert, ed. *The Letters of John Chamberlain*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939.
- McCoy, Richard. "'A Dangerous Image': The Earl of Essex and Elizabethan Chivalry." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 13 (1983): 313-29.
- McDonald, Russ, ed. *Shakespeare Reread: The Texts in New Contexts*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- McIlwain, Charles Howard, ed. *The Political Works of James I*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1918.
- McKeen, David. *A Memory of Honour: The Life of Henry Brooke, Lord Cobham*. Salzburg: Universitat Salzburg, 1986.
- McKisack, May. "Samuel Daniel as Historian." *Review of English Studies* 23, no. 91 (1947): 226-43.
- McManaway, James G. "Some Bibliographical Notes on Samuel Daniel's *Civil Wars*." *Studies in Bibliography* 4 (1951-52): 31-39.

- Mears, Natalie. "Courts, Courtiers, and Culture in Tudor England." *Historical Journal* 46, no. 3 (2003): 703-22.
- Melbourne, Jane. "The Inverted World of *Bussy D'Ambois*." *Studies in English Literature* 25, no. 2 (Spring, 1985): 381-95.
- Mellor, Ronald. "Tacitus, Academic Politics and Regicide in the Reign of Charles I: The Tragedy of Dr. Isaac Dorislaus." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 11, no. 2 (2004): 153-93.
- Menzer, Paul, ed. *Inside Shakespeare: Essays on the Blackfriars Stage*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2006.
- Meron, Theodor. "The Homeric Wars through Shakespeare." *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law)* 91 (Apr., 1997): 126-31.
- Michel, Laurence, ed. *'The Tragedy of Philotas' by Samuel Daniel*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949.
- Michel, Laurence, and George Burke Johnston. "Camden, Daniel, and Shakespeare." *PMLA* 77, no. 4 (1962): 510-12.
- Michel, Laurence, and Cecil C Seronsy. "Shakespeare's History Plays and Daniel: An Assessment." *Studies in Philology* 52, no. 4 (1955): 549-77.
- Miles, Gary B. "How Roman Are Shakespeare's Romans?" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (Autumn 1989): 257-83.
- Minto, William. *Characteristics of English Poets from Chaucer to Shirley*. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1889.
- Miola, Robert S. "*Julius Caesar* and the Tyrannicide Debate." *Renaissance Quarterly* 38, no. 2 (1985): 271-89.

- Montaigne, Michel de. *Essays*. Translated by John Florio. London: Putnam, 1904.
- Montrose, Louis. "Shakespeare, the Stage, and the State." University of Wisconsin Press 25, no. 2 (1996): 46-67.
- . *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theater*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996.
- Montrose, Louis Adrian. "Curious-Knotted Garden": The Form, Themes, and Contexts of Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost*. Edited by Erwin A. Sturzl, Salzburg Studies in English Literature. Salzburg: Universitat Salzburg, 1977.
- Montuori, Deborah. "The Confusion of Self and Role in Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois*." Studies in English Literature 28, no. 2 (Spring, 1988): 287-99.
- Morris, Helen. "Queen Elizabeth "Shadowed" In *Cleopatra*." Huntington Library Quarterly 32, no. 3 (1969): 271-78.
- Mynott, Glen. "'We Must Not Be More True to Kings / Than Kings Are to Their Subjects': France and the Politics of the Ancient Constitution in Chapman's Byron Plays." Renaissance Studies 9, no. 4 (Dec., 1995): 477-93.
- Nadel, George H. "Philosophy of History before Historicism." History and Theater 3, no. 3 (1964): 291-315.
- Nashe, Thomas. *Pierce Penniless His Supplication to the Devil*. In *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, edited by R.B. McMerrow. London: Bullen, 1910.
- Naunton, Robert. *Fragmenta Regalia*. Edited by Edward Arber. London: English Reprints, 1870.
- Neale, J.E. *Queen Elizabeth I*. London: Cape, 1958.

- Nichols, John, ed. *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*. London, 1823.
- Nicoll, Allardyce, ed. *Chapman's Homer*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967 (1611).
- Nicolson, William. *The English, Scotch and Irish Historical Libraries. Giving a Short View and Character of Most of Our Historians,... Etc.* London, 1766.
- Norgaard, Holger. "The Bleeding Captain Scene in *Macbeth* and Daniel's *Cleopatra*." *Review of English Studies* 6, no. 24 (1955): 395-96.
- Norman, Arthur M.Z. "Daniel's the *Tragedie of Cleopatra* and *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (1958): 11-18.
- . "The *Tragedie of Cleopatra* and the Date of *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Modern Language Review* 54, no. 1 (1959): 1-9.
- North, Thomas. *Plutarch's Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans*. Edited by George Wyndham. 12 vols. Vol. 4. New York: AMS Press, 1967.
- Orgel, Stephen, and Sean Keilen, eds. *Shakespeare and Society*. New York: Garland, 1999.
- Ornstein, Robert. *The Moral Vision of Jacobean Tragedy*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1960.
- Owst, G.R. *Literature and the Pulpit in Medieval England*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1961.
- Palgrave, Francis T., ed. *The Poetical Works of John Keats*. London: Macmillan, 1884.
- Parker, Barbara L. *Plato's 'Republic' and Shakespeare's Rome*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004.

- Parr, Johnstone. "The *Duke of Byron's* Malignant 'Caput Algol'." *Studies in Philology* 43, no. 2 (Apr., 1946): 194-202.
- Parrott, Thomas Marc, ed. *The Plays and Poems of George Chapman: The Tragedies*. London: Routledge and Sons, 1910.
- , ed. *The Plays of George Chapman: The Comedies*. 2 vols. New York: Russell and Russell, 1961.
- . "The Date of Chapman's *Bussy D'ambois*." *The Modern Language Review* 3, no. 2 (Jan., 1908): 126-40.
- Parry, Graham. *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- . "Patronage and the Printing of Learned Works for the Author." In *The Cambridge History of the Book of Britain: 1557-1695*, edited by John Barnard and D.F.M. McKenzie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Patterson, Annabel. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.
- . "'the Very Age and Body of the Time, His Form and Pressure': Re-Historicizing Shakespeare's Theater." *New Literary History* 20, no. 1 (1988): 83-104.
- . "'Back by Popular Demand': The Two Versions of Henry V." *Renaissance Drama* 19 (1989): 29-62.
- . *Reading Holinshed's 'Chronicles'*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Pattison, Mark. *Isaac Casaubon: 1559-1613*. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1892.

- Perry, Curtis. *The Making of Jacobean Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Persons, Robert. *A Conference About the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inglande*. New York: De Capo Press, 1972.
- Pitcher, John. "Samuel Daniel and the Authorities." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 10 (1998): 113-48.
- . "Benefitting from the Book: The Oxford Edition of Samuel Daniel." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 29 (1999): 69-87.
- . "Samuel Daniel, Poet and Historian." In *Dictionary of National Biography*: Oxford, 2008.
- . "Samuel Daniel, the Hertfords, and 'A Question of Love'." *The Review of English Studies* 35, no. 140 (Nov., 1984): 449-62.
- . "Samuel Daniel's Letter to Sir Thomas Egerton." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 47, no. 1 (Winter, 1984): 55-61.
- Pocock, J.G.A. *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1987.
- Postlewait, Thomas, and Bruce A. McConachie, eds. *Interpreting the Theatrical Past: Essay in the Historiography of Performance*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1989.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977.

- Praz, Mario. *The Flaming Heart; Essays on Crashaw, Machiavelli, and Other Studies in the Relations between Italian and English Literature from Chaucer to T.S. Eliot*. Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1966.
- Presson, Robert K. "Wrestling with This World: A View of George Chapman." *PMLA* 84, no. 1 (1969): 44-50.
- Preston, Joseph H. "Was There an Historical Revolution?" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 38, no. 2 (1977): 353-64.
- Price, George R. "*Henry V* and Germanicus." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 12, no. 1 (1961): 57-60.
- Price, Joseph G., ed. *The Triple Bond: Plays, Mainly Shakespearean, in Performance*. Pennsylvania Penn State University, 1975.
- Pricket, Robert. *Honors Fame in Triumph Riding, or, the Life and Death of the Late Honorable Earle of Essex*. London, 1604.
- Pugliatti, Paolo. *Shakespeare the Historian*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Puttenham, George. *The Art of English Poesy*. Edited by Frank Whigham and Wayne A. Rebhorn. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, (1589) 2007.
- Quiller-Couch, Arthur. *Adventures in Criticism*. New York: Charles Scribner, 1896.
- Quinn, Kelly A. "Fulke Greville's Friendly Patronage." *Studies in English Literature* 103, no. 4 (2006): 417-35.
- Quint, David. "'Alexander the Pig': Shakespeare on History and Poetry." *boundary 2* 10, no. 3 (1982): 49-67.
- . *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

- Rabkin, Norman. "Rabbits, Ducks, 'Henry V'." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 28, no. 3 (1977): 279-96.
- . *Shakespeare and the Problem of Meaning*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1981.
- Rackin, Phyllis. *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Reay, Barry, ed. *Popular Culture in Seventeenth Century England*. New York: St. Martin's, 1985.
- Rebhorn, Wayne. "The Crisis of the Aristocracy in *Julius Caesar*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 43 (1990): 75-111.
- Rees, Ennis. *The Tragedies of George Chapman: Renaissance Ethics in Action*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- . "Chapman's *Blind Beggar* and the Marlovian Hero." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 57, no. 1 (Jan., 1958): 60-63.
- Rees, Joan. "Shakespeare's Use of Daniel." *Modern Language Review* 55, no. 1 (1960): 79-82.
- . *Samuel Daniel: A Critical and Biographical Study*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1964.
- Reese, M. M. *The Royal Office of Master of the Horse*. London: Rowman & Littlefield, 1976.
- Ribner, Irving. *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare*. London: Methuen, 1957.

- . "Character and Theme in Chapman's *Bussy D'ambois*." *English Literary History* 26, no. 4 (Dec., 1959): 482-96.
- . "Bolingbroke, a True Machiavellian." *Modern Language Quarterly* 9 (Fall 1948): 177-84.
- Rosenmeyer, Thomas G. *Sencean Drama and Stoic Cosmology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Rowse, A.L. *Court and Country: Studies in Tudor Social History*. London: Methuen, 1987.
- Rusen, Jorn. *Narration-Interpretation-Orientation*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2005.
- Rutt, John Towell, ed. *Diary of Thomas Burton, Esq: 1656-69*. 4 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1828.
- Saccio, Peter. *Shakespeare's English Kings: Historym Chronicle, and Drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Salmon, J.H.M. "Stoicism and Roman Example: Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50 (Spring 1989): 199-225.
- Saul, Nigel. *Richard II*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Savile, Henry. *The Ende of Nero and the Beginning of Galba*. London, 1598.
- Saviolo, Vincentio. *Vincento Savioo, His Practise in Two Bookes, the First Intreating of the Use of the Rapier And Dagger. The Second, of Honor and Honorable Quarrels*. London, 1595.
- Schanzer, Ernest. "Daniel's Revision of his *Cleopatra*." *The Review of English Studies* 8, no. 23 (Nov., 1957): 375-81.

- Schrickx, W. *Shakespeare's Early Contemporaries*. Antwerp: De Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1956.
- Schwartz, Elias. "Seneca, Homer, and Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois*." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 56, no. 2 (Apr., 1957): 163-76.
- . "The Date of Chapman's *Byron* Plays." *Modern Philology* 58, no. 3 (Feb., 1961): 201-02.
- . "The Dates and Order of Chapman's Tragedies." *Modern Philology* 57, no. 2 (Nov., 1959): 80-82.
- . "The Date of *Bussy D'Ambois*." *Modern Philology* 59, no. 2 (Nov., 1961): 126-27.
- . "Chapman's Renaissance Man: *Byron* Reconsidered." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 58, no. 4 (Oct., 1959): 613-26.
- Seronsy, Cecil. "The Doctrine of Cyclical Recurrence and Some Related Ideas in the Works of Samuel Daniel." *Studies in Philology* 54, no. 3 (1957): 387-407.
- . *Samuel Daniel*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1967.
- . "The Case for Daniel's Letter to Egerton Reopened." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (Nov., 1965): 79-82.
- . "Daniel's *Panegyrike* and the Earl of Hertford." *Philological Quarterly* 32 (1953): 342-44.
- . "Daniel's Manuscript *Civil Wars* with Some Previously Unpublished Stanzas." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 52, no. 2 (Apr., 1953): 153-60.

- . "Well-Languaged Daniel: A Reconsideration." *The Modern Language Review* 52, no. 4 (Oct., 1957): 481-97.
- Seronsy, Cecil, and Robert Kruger. "A Manuscript of Daniel's *Civil Wars*, Book III." *Studies in Philology* 63, no. 2 (April, 1966): 157-62.
- Serres, Jean de, and Pierre Matthieu. *L'histoire De France & Des Choses Memorables, Avenues Des Provinces Etrangeres Durant Sept Anees De Paix. Du Regne Du Roy, Henrie IIII*. Roy De France & De Navarre. Leyden 1608.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Henry V*. Edited by J.H. Walter, Arden 2. London: Methuen, 1954.
- . *Richard II*. Edited by Peter Ure, Arden 2. London: Methuen, 1956.
- . *King Henry IV, Part 1*. Edited by A.R. Humphreys, Arden 2. London: Methuen, 1960.
- . *King Henry IV, Part 2*. Edited by A.R. Humphreys, Arden 2. London: Methuen, 1966.
- . *Coriolanus*. Edited by Philip Brockbank, Arden 2. London: Routledge, 1976.
- . *King Henry VI, Part 1*. Edited by Andrew S. Cairncross, Arden 2. London: Methuen, 1980.
- . *Hamlet*. Edited by Harold Jenkins, Arden 2. London: Methuen, 1982.
- . *Troilus and Cressida*. Edited by Kenneth Muir, The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- . *Henry V*. Edited by Gary Taylor, The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

- . *Troilus and Cressida*. Edited by Kenneth Palmer, Arden 2. London: Routledge, 1982.
- . *Antony and Cleopatra*. Edited by David Bevington, The New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- . *The Tragedy of Coriolanus*. Edited by R.B Parker, The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- . *Antony and Cleopatra*. Edited by John Wilders, Arden 3. London: Methuen, 1995.
- . *King Henry V*, Arden 3. London: Methuen, 1995.
- . *'the First Part of King Henry the Fourth': Text and Contexts*. Edited by Barbara Hodgdon. Boston: Bedford, 1997.
- . *Julius Caesar*. Edited by David Daniell, Arden 3. London: Methuen, 1998.
- . *Troilus and Cressida*. Edited by David Bevington, Arden 3. London: Cengage Learning, 1998.
- . *Henry IV, Part 2*. Edited by Rene Weis, The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- . *Love's Labour's Lost*. Edited by H.R. Woudhuysen, Arden 3. London: Methuen, 2001.
- . *King Henry IV, Part 1*. Edited by David Scott Kastan, Arden 3. London: Methuen, 2002.
- . *Richard II*. Edited by Charles S. Forker, Arden 3. London: Methuen, 2002.
- . *Hamlet*. Edited by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, Arden 3. London: Thomson Learning, 2006.

- Shapiro, James. *1599: A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare*. London: Methuen, 2005.
- Shapiro, Michael. *Children of the Revels: The Boy Companies of Shakespeare's Time and Their Plays*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.
- . "'Boying Her Greatness': Shakespeare's Use of Coterie Drama in *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Modern Language Review* 77, no. 1 (1982): 1-15.
- Sharpe, Kevin. "Stuart Monarchy and Political Culture." In *Oxford Illustrated History of Tudor and Stuart Britain*, edited by John Morrill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Sharpe, Kevin, and Peter Lake, eds. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. London: Macmillan, 1994.
- Shephard, Robert. "Court Factions in Early Modern England." *Journal of Modern History* 64, no. 4 (1992): 721-45.
- Shuger, Debora. "The 'I' of the Beholder: Renaissance Mirrors and the Reflexive Mind." In *Renaissance Culture and the Everyday*, edited by Patricia Fumerton and Simon Hunt. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Sidney, Philip, ed. *Conversations of William Drummond with Ben Jonson at Hawthornden*. London: Gay and Bird, 1900.
- Simpson, C H Herford and Percy, ed. *Ben Jonson*. 11 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Simpson, Richard. "The Politics of Shakespeare's Historical Plays." *Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society* 2, no. 1 (1874): 396-441.

- Skura, Meredith. *Shakespeare the Actor and the Purposes of Playing*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1993.
- Slavin, A.J. "On Henrician Politics: Games and Dramas." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 60, no. 3 (1997): 249-71.
- Smith, Alan G.R. "The Secretariats of the Cecils, Circa 1580-1612." *English Historical Review* 83, no. 328 (1968): 481-504.
- Smith, Bruce R. *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991.
- Smith, L.B. *Treason in Tudor England: Politics and Paranoia*. London: Random House, 1990.
- Smith, Winifred. "The Earl of Essex on Stage." *PMLA* 39, no. 1 (March 1924): 147-73.
- Snaith, Guy. "The Portrayal of Power in La Calprenède's *Le Comte D'Essex*." *Modern Language Review* 81, no. 4 (1986): 853-65.
- Snare, Gerald. "George Chapman." <http://www.poetryfoundation.org/bio/george-chapman>.
- Snow, Vernon F. "Essex and the Aristocratic Opposition to the Early Stuarts." *Journal of Modern History* 32, no. 3 (1960): 224-33.
- . *Essex the Rebel: The Life of Robert Devereux, the Third Earl of Essex: 1591-1646*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.
- Solve, Norma Dolbe. "Stuart Politics in Chapman's *Tragedy of Chabot*." *University of Michigan Publications in Language and Literature* 4 (1928).
- Sowerby, Robin. "Chapman's Discovery of Homer." *Translation & Literature* 1 (1992): 26-51.

- Spedding, James, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath. *The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*. 14 vols. London: Longman, 1861-79.
- Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. London: Penguin, (1590) 1987.
- . *A Viewe of the Present State of Ireland*. Edited by Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley. London: Wiley-Blackwell, (1598) 1997.
- Spiekerman, Tim. *Shakespeare's Political Realism: The English History Plays*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.
- Spivak, Charlotte. *George Chapman*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1967.
- Starkey, David. *The English Court From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*. London: Longman, 1987.
- Stirling, Brents. "Daniel's *Philotas* and the Essex Case." *Modern Language Quarterly* 3 (1942): 583-94.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Strathmann, Ernest A. "The Textual Evidence for 'the School of Night'." *Modern Language Notes* 56, no. 3 (Mar., 1941): 176-86.
- Strong, Roy. *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1986.
- Swinburne, Algernon Charles. *George Chapman: A Critical Essay*. New York: Lemma Publishing, 1972.
- Tacitus, Cornelius. *The Ende of Nero and the Beginning of Galba: Fower Bookes of the Histories of Cornelius Tacitus*. Translated by Sir Henry Savile. London, 1591.
- . *The Annales of Cornelius Tacitus*. Translated by Richard Grenaway. London, 1598.

- . *The Histories*. Translated by Rhiannon Ash. London: Penguin, 2009.
- Taylor, Michael, ed. *Shakespeare Criticism in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Taylor, Marion A. *'Bottom Thou Art Translated': Political Allegory in 'a Midsummer Night's Dream'*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1973.
- Tennenhouse, Leonard. "Playing and Power." In *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, edited by David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Tenney, Mary F. "Tacitus in the Politics of Early Stuart England." *The Classical Journal* 37, no. 3 (Dec., 1941): 151-63.
- Tillson, Kathleen. "Drayton and *Richard II*." *Review of English Studies* 15, no. 58 (1939): 172-79.
- Tillyard, E.M.W. *Shakespeare's History Plays*. New York: Macmillan, 1946.
- Tipton, Alzada. "Caught between 'Virtue' and 'Memorie': Providential and Political Historiography in Samuel Daniel's the *Civil Wars*." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 61, no. 3/4 (1998): 325-41.
- . "'Lively Patterns ... For Affayres of State': Sir John Hayward's the *Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII* and the Earl of Essex." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 33, no. 3 (2002): 769-94.
- . "The Transformation of the Earl of Essex: Post-Execution Ballads and 'the Pheonix and the Turtle'." *Studies in Philology* 99, no. 1 (Winter 2002): 57-80.
- Trevelyan, Raleigh. *Sir Walter Raleigh*. New York: Henry Holt, 2002.

- Tricomi, A. H. "The Dates of the Plays of George Chapman." *English Literary Review* 12 (1982): 242-66.
- . *Anticourt Drama in England*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1989.
- . "Two Letters Concerning George Chapman." *The Modern Language Review* 75, no. 2 (Apr., 1980): 241-48.
- . "Philip, Earl of Pembroke, and the Analogical Way of Reading Political Tragedy." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 85, no. 3 (Jul., 1986): 332-45.
- Ure, Peter. "Chapman's Tragedy of *Bussy D'Ambois*: Problems of the Revised Quarto." *The Modern Language Review* 48, no. 3 (Jul., 1953): 257-69.
- . "The Main Outline of Chapman's *Byron*." *Studies in Philology* 47, no. 4 (Oct., 1950): 568-88.
- . "Fulke Greville's Dramatic Characters." *The Review of English Studies* 1, no. 4 (Oct., 1950): 308-23.
- . "A Note On "Opinion" In Daniel, Greville and Chapman." *The Modern Language Review* 46, no. 3/4 (Oct., 1951): 331-38.
- . "Chapman's *Tragedy of Byron*, IV, ii, 291-5." *The Modern Language Review* 54, no. 4 (Oct., 1959): 557-58.
- Vickers, Brian, ed. *Francis Bacon: Major Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Waddington, Raymond B. "Chapman's *Andromeda Liberata*: Mythology and Meaning." *PMLA* 1, no. 1 (1966): 34-44.
- Waith, Eugene M. *The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare, and Dryden*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

- Walker, Julia M., ed. *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Wallace, John M. "'Examples Are Best Precepts': Readers and Meanings in Seventeenth-Century Poetry." *Critical Inquiry* 1, no. 2 (Dec., 1974): 273-90.
- Walsingham, Thomas. *The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland During the Middle Ages*. Edited by Henry Thomas Riley. 2 vols. London: Longman, 1864.
- Wecter, Dixon. "Shakespeare's Purpose in *Timon of Athens*." *PMLA* 43, no. 3 (1928): 701-21.
- Wells, Robin Headlam. "'Manhood and Chevalrie': *Coriolanus*, Prince Henry, and the Chivalric Revival." *The Review of English Studies* 51, no. 203 (Aug. 2000): 395-422.
- Whigham, Frank. *Ambition and Privilege: The Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Discourse*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- Wieler, John William. *George Chapman - the Effect of Stoicism Upon His Tragedies*. New York: King's Crown Press, 1949.
- Wilkes, G.A. "Daniel's *Philotas* and the Essex Case: A Reconsideration." *Modern Language Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (1962): 233-42.
- William Oram, Einar Bjorvand, and Ronald Bond, eds. *Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1989.

- Williams, Franklin B., *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books before 1641*. London: Biographical Society, 1962.
- Wilmer, S.E., ed. *Writing and Rewriting National Theater Histories*. Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 2004.
- Wilson, Richard, and Richard Dutton, eds. *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama*. London: Longman, 1992.
- Womersely, David. "Sir Henry Savile's Translation of Tacitus and the Political Interpretation of Elizabethan Texts." *Review of English Studies* 42, no. 167 (1991): 313-42.
- Woolf, D.R. "Erudition and the Idea of History." *Renaissance Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (1987): 11-48.
- . "Community, Law and State: Samuel Daniel's Historical Thought Revisited." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 49, no. 1 (1988): 61-83.
- . *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture: 1500-1730*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Worden, Blair. "Classical Republicanism and the Puritan Revolution." In *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper*, edited by Hugh Lloyd Jones, Valerie Pearl and Blair Worden. London: Duckworth, 1981.
- . *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's 'Arcadia' and Elizabethan Politics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- . "Historians and Poets." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68, no. 1/2 (2005): 71-93.

- . "Shakespeare in Life and Art: Biography and *Richard II*." In *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*, edited by Takashi Tozuka and J.R. Mulryne. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Worthen, W.B., and Peter Holland, eds. *Theorizing Practice: Redefining Theater History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003.
- Wright, Gillian. "Samuel Daniel's Use of Sources in the *Civil Wars*." *Studies in Philology* 101, no. 1 (2004): 59-87.
- Wynter, Phillip, ed. *The Works of the Right Reverend Joseph Hall*. 10 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1839.
- Yachnin, Paul. "History, Theatricality, and the Structural Problem in the *Henry IV* Plays." *Philological Quarterly* 70 (1990): 163-79.
- Yates, Francis Amelia. *A Study of 'Love's Labour's Lost'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.
- Zeeveld, W. Gordon. "Coriolanus and Jacobean Politics." *Modern Language Review* 57, no. 3 (Jul. 1962): 321-44.

VITA

Matthew Bran Davies was born in Surrey, England on February 22, 1965, the son of Christine and Gareth Davies. He graduated in English Literature with Honors from Exeter University in Devon in 1987, before embarking upon a career as an actor. Following extensive tours of American universities as a performer with Actors From The London Stage, he entered the Graduate School of English at the University of Texas at Austin in 2004. He is currently an Assistant Professor in the MLITT/MFA program in Shakespeare and Performance at Mary Baldwin College in association with the American Shakespeare Center in Staunton, Virginia.

Permanent Address: 211 Fayette Street, Staunton, Virginia, 24401.